

1 John P. Kristensen (SBN 224132)
2 **KRISTENSEN LAW GROUP**
3 120 Santa Barbara St., Suite C9
4 Santa Barbara, California 93101
5 Telephone: (805) 837-2000
john@kristensen.law

6 Jarrett L. Ellzey (Texas Bar No. 24040864)
7 Leigh S. Montgomery (*Pro Hac Vice*)
8 Tommy Kherkher (*Pro Hac Vice*)
9 Josh Sanford (*Pro Hac Vice*)
10 **EKSM, LLP**
11 1105 Milford Street
12 Houston, Texas 77006
13 Telephone: (888) 350-3931

14 **ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF AND THE
PUTATIVE CLASS**

15 **THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SOUTHERN DIVISION**

16 TRENTON SMITH, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

17 Plaintiffs,
18 vs.

19 JOHN SHAHIDI, an individual;
20 NELK, INC. dba NELK, FULL
SEND, a Canadian Company,
21 METACARD, LLC, a Delaware
Limited Liability Company; NELK
22 USA, INC., a Delaware Corporation;
23 KYLE FORGEARD, an individual.

24 Defendants.

25) Case No.: 8:25-cv-161-FWS-DFM
26)
27) [Discovery Document: Referred to
28) Magistrate Judge Douglas F.
) McCormick]
)
) DECLARATION OF JOHN P.
) KRISTENSEN IN SUPPORT OF
) PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
)
) Hearing Date: Oct. 14, 2025
) Time: 10:00 a.m.
)
) Discovery Cut Off: April 9, 2026
) PreTrial Conference: Oct. 29, 2026
) Trial Date: Nov. 17, 2026
)
)
)
)
)

DECLARATION OF JOHN P. KRISTENSEN

I, John P. Kristensen, declare:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before all Courts in the State of California. I am a Partner at Kristensen Law Group, Counsel of record for plaintiff Trenton Smith (“Plaintiff”) in this action. I make this declaration of my own personal knowledge, and if called to testify, I could and would competently testify hereto under oath.

2. As required by Local Rule 37-1, on August 22, 2025, September 2, 2025 and September 9, 2025, counsel for the parties met and conferred via Zoom and have also sent numerous correspondences to discuss these issues in a good faith effort to eliminate as many of the disputes as possible. The relevant written correspondences are attached to this declaration. Plaintiff has gone above and beyond meeting his meet and confer requirements under Local Rule 37.

3. I have attached hereto as Exhibit "1" a true and correct copy of Defendant Nelk, Inc., Nelk USA, Inc., and Metacard, LLC's objections and responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents, Sets One through Three, served on August 6, 2025.

4. I have attached hereto as Exhibit "2" a true and correct copy of Defendant Nelk, Inc., Nelk USA, Inc., and Metacard, LLC's objections and responses to Plaintiff's Interrogatories, Set One, served on August 6, 2025.

5. On August 14, 2025, I sent a correspondence to Defendants seeking a LR 37-1 Conference about the interrogatories. I have attached hereto as Exhibit "3" a true and correct copy of the correspondence.

6. On August 22, 2025, I had a zoom meeting with Defense counsel. Who wanted Plaintiff's version of the Joint Stipulation before meeting, claiming they could not have a meaningful meet and confer.

7. On August 22, 2025, I sent a correspondence to Defendants seeking a LR 37-1 Conference about the requests for production. I have attached hereto as

1 Exhibit "4" a true and correct copy of the correspondence.

2 8. On September 1, 2025, I sent a further correspondence to Defendants
3 about the responses to requests for production. I have attached hereto as Exhibit "5"
4 a true and correct copy of the correspondence.

5 9. On September 3, 2025, I sent a further correspondence to Defendants
6 about the responses to interrogatories. I have attached hereto as Exhibit "6" a true
7 and correct copy of the correspondence.

8 10. The parties have been negotiating a protective order, after Plaintiff
9 raised the issue on or about July 7, 2025. The final dispute is about post judgment
10 maintenance of the documents. Plaintiff's counsel has obligations to maintain their
11 clients' records for up to five years potentially. Plaintiff agrees to post final
12 judgment destruction, as long as Defense counsel agrees to maintain a copy of what
13 was designated for that time period. Defense rejects that compromise. I have
14 attached the redline version last sent by myself to defense counsel on September 1,
15 2025 as Exhibit "7" a true and correct copy of the Protective Order.

16 11. I have attached as Exhibits "8" and "9" the order establishing the initial
17 case schedule (DE 63) as well as an amendment (DE67).

18

19 I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of
20 America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on September 23, 2025 at
21 Santa Barbara, California.

22

23

24

/s/ John P. Kristensen

John P. Kristensen

25

26

27

28

DECLARATION OF JOHN P. KRISTENSEN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on Tuesday, September 23, 2025, a true and correct copy of the attached **DECLARATION OF JOHN P. KRISTENSEN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION**, was served via CM/ECF to all participants of record, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5:

/s/ John P. Kristensen
John P. Kristensen

EXHIBIT 1

COOLEY LLP
WILLIAM K. PAO (252637)
(wpao@cooley.com)
ARIANA BUSTOS (345918)
(abustos@cooley.com)
355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 561-3250
Facsimile: (213) 561-3244

BRIAN M. FRENCH (*pro hac vice*)
(bfrench@cooley.com)
RONA S. LI (*pro hac vice*)
(rproper@cooley.com)
KATHERINE BECHTEL (*pro hac vice*)
(kbechtel@cooley.com)
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2157
Telephone: (212) 479-6000
Facsimile: (212) 479-6275

LUKE C. CADIGAN (*pro hac vice*)
(lcadigan@cooley.com)
500 Boylston Street, 14th Floor
Boston, MA 02116-3736
Telephone: (617) 937-2300
Facsimile: (617) 937-2400

*Attorneys for Defendants John Shahidi, Nelk, Inc.,
Metacard, LLC, Nelk USA, Inc., and Kyle
Forgeard*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION**

TRENTON SMITH and MICHAEL BURROW, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Case No. 8:25-cv-161-FWS-DFM
CLASS ACTION

Plaintiff.

vs.

JOHN SHAHIDI, NELK, INC.,
METACARD, LLC, NELK USA, INC.,
and KYLE FORGEARD

**DEFENDANTS NELK, INC.,
NELK USA, INC. & METACARD,
LLC'S OBJECTIONS AND
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF
TRENTON SMITH'S REQUESTS
FOR PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS, SETS ONE
THROUGH THREE**

Defendants.

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF TRENTON SMITH**

2 **RESPONDING PARTY: DEFENDANTS NELK, INC., NELK USA, INC. &**
3 **METACARD, LLC**

4 **SET NUMBER: ONE (1) THROUGH THREE (3)**

5 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rules 26 and 34, Nelk, Inc., Nelk
6 USA, Inc., and Metacard, LLC (together “Defendants”) object and respond to
7 Plaintiff Trenton Smith’s Requests for Production of Documents, Sets One through
8 Three (the “Requests for Production” or “Requests”), dated July 7, 2025, in the
9 above-captioned action (the “Action”).

10 Defendants provide these Responses, and any Document produced in response
11 to the Requests, without waiver of or prejudice to (i) their right at any later time to
12 raise objections as to the relevance, materiality, privilege, work-product character or
13 admissibility as evidence, for any purpose, of (a) the Requests or any part thereof,
14 (b) statements made in these Responses to the Requests or any part thereof, or (c) any
15 information disclosed and/or any Documents produced as part of Defendants’
16 Responses to the Requests or any part thereof; (ii) their right to object to the use of
17 any Documents produced in response to these Requests in any subsequent
18 proceedings or the trial of this Action or any other action; or (iii) their right to object
19 on any ground at any time to a demand for further response to these Requests or other
20 discovery requests in this Action.

21 **I. GENERAL OBJECTIONS.**

22 The General Objections set forth below apply to the Requests generally and to
23 the Definitions, Instructions, and the Individual Requests set forth therein. Unless
24 otherwise stated, the General Objections shall have the same force and effect as if set
25 forth in full in response to each Definition, Instruction, and Request. Any undertaking
26 to search for, or provide information or Documents in response to, any Request is
27 made subject to the General Objections.

1 1. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
2 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they seek to impose burdens or
3 obligations on Defendants that are broader than, inconsistent with or not authorized
4 under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the United States
5 District Court for the Central District of California, other applicable rules or laws,
6 the Stipulated Protective Order to be entered in this Action, the discovery protocol to
7 be agreed upon by the parties, or any other order entered by the Court in or applicable
8 to, this Action (the “Applicable Rules”). Subject to and without waiving any
9 objections, in responding to these Requests Defendants will construe the Requests in
10 accordance with the Applicable Rules.

11 2. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
12 and Instructions set forth therein, on the grounds that they seek Documents or
13 information (including electronic data) protected from discovery by the attorney-
14 client privilege, work-product doctrine, common interest privilege, joint defense
15 privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, exemption, or immunity from
16 discovery afforded under any applicable statute, rule, regulation, or the common law
17 (“Privileged Information”). Defendants claim such privileges and protections to the
18 extent implicated by the Requests and excludes privileged or protected material from
19 their responses to the Requests. Any disclosure of such privileged or protected
20 material in response to the Requests is inadvertent and not intended to waive those
21 privileges and protections. If a Document or information containing or reflecting
22 Privileged Information is inadvertently produced by Defendants, Plaintiff will return
23 the Document or information and not rely on it. Defendants expressly reserve the
24 right to object at any stage of this action to the introduction into evidence of
25 Documents and information prepared by or at the direction of Defendants’ attorneys,
26 or by its attorneys’ representatives or agents in anticipation of litigation or for trial,
27 and Documents and information subject to any other privilege, protection, or
28 immunity available under governing law.

1 3. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
2 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they seek Documents or
3 information protected by their privacy rights or the privacy rights of other defendants
4 in this Action and/or third parties. Any disclosure of such material in response to the
5 Requests is inadvertent and not intended to waive those protections. Defendants
6 reserve the right to demand that Plaintiff return, destroy, or sequester any such
7 Documents produced and all copies thereof consistent with the Applicable Rules.

8 4. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
9 and Instructions set forth therein, on the grounds that they seek Documents or
10 information that are not relevant to the subject matter of the Action or to any claims
11 or defenses at issue in the Action.

12 5. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
13 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they purport to require Defendants
14 to produce Documents without any date restriction, or without regard to the Relevant
15 Period, and therefore seek Documents that are not relevant to any party's claim or
16 defense or proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants' counsel is willing to
17 meet and confer with Plaintiff to determine an appropriate time period for the
18 Requests.

19 6. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
20 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they seek Documents that are
21 cumulative or duplicative.

22 7. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
23 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they are vague, ambiguous, or fail
24 to describe the requested Documents or information with reasonable particularity, on
25 the grounds that such failure impermissibly requires Defendants to speculate as to
26 the Documents Plaintiff seeks.

27 8. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
28 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they seek "all Documents"

1 concerning a matter, on the grounds that such Requests are unreasonable, unduly
2 burdensome, duplicative, cumulative, and seek irrelevant Documents. To the extent
3 that Documents are produced in response to such Requests, they will be limited to
4 Documents sufficient to show matters that are appropriately discoverable and
5 proportional to the needs of the Action.

6 9. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
7 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they purport to require Defendants
8 to conduct anything beyond a reasonable and diligent search for readily accessible
9 Documents (including electronic Documents) from readily available sources
10 (including electronic sources) where responsive Documents reasonably would be
11 expected to be found, and to the extent that the Requests purport to require
12 Defendants to exceed their obligations under the Applicable Rules.

13 10. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
14 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they purport to impose an
15 obligation to produce any information or Documents that are newly created or
16 received after the receipt of Requests, because efforts to produce such information or
17 Documents would be unduly burdensome and require unreasonable expense.

18 11. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
19 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they purport to require Defendants
20 to draw subjective or legal conclusions, or are predicated on subjective or legal
21 conclusions or arguments. Subject to and without waiving any objection,
22 Defendants state that any response, production of Documents, or provision of
23 information in response to the Requests is not intended to provide, and shall not
24 constitute or be construed as providing, an admission concerning any of the terms
25 used in the Requests.

26 12. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
27 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that the Requests, Definitions, or
28 Instructions contain inaccurate, incomplete or misleading descriptions of the facts,

1 persons, relationships, or events underlying the Action. Defendants further object to
2 the Requests, including the Definitions and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent
3 that they assume the existence of facts that do not exist or the occurrence of events
4 that did not take place. Any response, production of Documents or provision of
5 information in response to the Requests is not intended to provide, and shall not
6 constitute or be construed as providing, an admission that any factual predicates
7 stated in the Requests are accurate.

8 13. Defendants object generally to the Requests, including the Definitions
9 and Instructions set forth therein, to the extent that they purport to require production
10 of Documents within 30 days on the grounds that such request is unreasonable and
11 unduly burdensome. Defendants will make their productions on a rolling basis until
12 complete.

13 14. Defendants' agreement to produce the Documents identified below is
14 subject to the parties' ability to reach agreement on appropriate search terms,
15 custodians, and a date range to collect potentially responsive Documents. Defendants
16 will collect Documents for review in accordance with an agreement between the
17 parties or order of the Court.

18 15. Defendants will produce such Documents or information only in
19 accordance with the Applicable Rules.

20 16. A response by Defendants that they will produce Documents in
21 response to a specific Request shall not be interpreted as an affirmation that such
22 Documents in fact exist or that they are within Defendants' possession, custody, or
23 control. Such a response is merely intended to reflect that if non-objectionable, non-
24 privileged Documents exist, are within Defendants' possession, custody, or control
25 and are identified pursuant to a search conducted in accordance with search
26 parameters to be agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the Court, Defendants will
27 produce them in response to the specific Request.

28 17. Defendants respond to these Requests to the best of their present

1 knowledge and reserve the right to revise, correct, amend and/or supplement their
2 objections and responses to the Requests.

3 18. Defendants' counsel is available to meet and confer at a mutually
4 agreeable time regarding the appropriate scope of any Requests to which Defendants
5 have objected. To the extent the parties reach agreement on any different or further
6 production in response to such Request, Defendants will endeavor to conduct a
7 reasonable and proportional search for and produce relevant, responsive, non-
8 privileged Documents, if any exist, within a reasonable time following such
9 agreement.

10 **II. OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS.**

11 1. Defendants object to the definition of "Computer System" as overly
12 broad, unduly burdensome, vague, and ambiguous, including with respect to the
13 terms "file servers," "workstations," and "personal digital assistants." Unless
14 otherwise stated and to the extent possible, Defendants will construe the terms in this
15 definition in accordance with their ordinary and accepted meanings and the
16 Applicable Rules.

17 2. Defendants object to the definition of "Document" as overly broad,
18 unduly burdensome, vague, and ambiguous. Unless otherwise stated and to the extent
19 possible, Defendants will construe the terms in this definition in accordance with
20 their ordinary and accepted meanings and the Applicable Rules.

21 3. Defendants object to the definition of "Electronically Stored
22 Information" or "ESI" as overly broad, unduly burdensome, vague, ambiguous, and
23 exceeding the scope of permissible discovery set forth in the Applicable Rules or any
24 other protocol relating to ESI to be agreed to by the parties and the Court. Specifically,
25 Defendants object on the grounds that the definition, which includes "backup tapes,
26 metadata" and "data compilations stored in any medium from which information can
27 be obtained" would require Defendants to incur costs disproportionate to Plaintiff's
28 need for such Documents or information. Defendants further object to the extent that

1 the definition encompasses Documents and information that are not relevant or
2 readily accessible through reasonable means. Defendants will produce ESI in
3 accordance with the Applicable Rules and an order to be agreed upon by the parties,
4 and entered by the Court, governing the discovery of ESI.

5 4. Defendants object to the definition of “Log File” as overly broad,
6 unduly burdensome, vague, and ambiguous, including with respect to the terms
7 “automatically collected” and “includes, but is not limited to.” Unless otherwise
8 stated and to the extent possible, Defendants will construe the terms in this definition
9 in accordance with their ordinary and accepted meanings and the Applicable Rules.

10 5. Defendants object to the definition of “Nelk” as overly broad, unduly
11 burdensome, vague, and ambiguous. Defendants further object to the definition to
12 the extent that it purports to impute to Nelk any knowledge of persons or entities
13 falling within the scope of the term as Plaintiff has defined it, or imposes on Nelk
14 duties to ascertain the identity, existence, or relationships of or among any of the
15 persons listed. Unless otherwise stated and to the extent possible, Defendants will
16 construe the terms in this definition in accordance with their ordinary and accepted
17 meanings and the Applicable Rules.

18 **III. OBJECTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONS.**

19 1. Defendants object to Instruction A to the extent that it seeks to impose
20 on Defendants discovery obligations exceeding or inconsistent with the Applicable
21 Rules, including, but not limited to, the discovery protocol to be agreed upon by the
22 parties. Defendants further object to Instruction A to the extent that it imposes
23 burdens on Defendants that are disproportionate to Plaintiff’s need for the Documents
24 or information and would subject Defendants to unreasonable and undue burden and
25 expense. Defendants further object to Instruction A to the extent that it seeks
26 Documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
27 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privileges,
28 protections, or immunities.

1 2. Defendants object to Instruction B to the extent that it seeks to impose
2 on Defendants discovery obligations exceeding or inconsistent with the Applicable
3 Rules, including, but not limited to, the discovery protocol to be agreed upon by the
4 parties.

5 3. Defendants object to Instruction C to the extent that it seeks to impose
6 on Defendants discovery obligations exceeding or inconsistent with the Applicable
7 Rules, including, but not limited to, the discovery protocol to be agreed upon by the
8 parties.

9 4. Defendants object to the “Instructions re Privilege Log” to the extent
10 they seek to impose on Defendants discovery obligations exceeding or inconsistent
11 with the Applicable Rules, including, but not limited to, the discovery protocol to be
12 agreed upon by the parties.

13 **IV. SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO DOCUMENT REQUESTS.**

14 Defendants submit the following Specific Objections and Responses to the
15 Requests. The presence or absence of a Specific Objection to a Request is not an
16 admission that Documents responsive to that Request exist. Defendants incorporate
17 their General Objections into each Response below.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:**

19 All **DOCUMENTS** including any insurance records, the complete policy
20 (including any addendums or documents identifying additional insureds, etc.) for any
21 policy of insurance through which **YOU** were or might be insured in any manner (for
22 example, primary, pro-rata, or excess liability coverage or medical expense coverage)
23 for the damages, claims, or actions that have arisen out of this matter.

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 1:**

25 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
26 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
27 “all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
28 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs

1 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
2 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
3 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
4 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
5 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
7 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 2:**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
10 **MESSAGES**) regarding the ownership/structure of **NELK**, **NELK USA**, and
11 **METACARD, LLC**, including in by-laws, corporate minutes, shareholder
12 percentages and filings with the California Secretary of State or any federal (Canada
13 too), provincial, state or local entity.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 2:**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
18 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
19 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
20 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
21 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
22 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
23 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
24 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
25 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
26 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
27 produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the term "filings"
28 as vague and ambiguous.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants'
3 possession, custody, or control sufficient to show the ownership and/or corporate
4 structure of Nelk, Inc., Nelk USA, Inc., and Metacard, LLC.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 3:**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
7 **MESSAGES**) identifying the roles, responsibilities, and involvement of any
8 individual in the conception, launch, and operation of the Metacard NFT project.
9 This includes organizational charts, internal memos, or communications describing
10 who was in charge of finances, marketing, project development, customer relations,
11 and other operational aspects.

12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 3:**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
16 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
17 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
18 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
19 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
20 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
21 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
22 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
23 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
24 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
25 produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

26 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
27 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants'
28 possession, custody, or control sufficient to identify the individuals involved in the

1 conception, launch, and operation of the Metacard project and their respective roles
2 and responsibilities.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:**

4 All agreements or contracts between or among any of the Defendants
5 (including with third parties and vendors) relating to the Metacard project or the
6 FullSend Metacard venture. This includes partnership or joint venture agreements,
7 operating agreements for Metacard, LLC, employment or consulting contracts (if
8 any) for individuals working on the project, and any documents delineating authority
9 or decision-making structure for the project.

10 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 4:**

11 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
12 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
13 “all” agreements or contracts relating to the Request. Defendants further object to
14 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not
15 proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the
16 extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client
17 privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other
18 applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this
19 Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession,
20 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
21 documents or information are public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or
22 that such documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or
23 information that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants
24 further object to the phrase “relating to the Metacard project or the FullSend
25 Metacard venture,” as vague and ambiguous.

26 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
27 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
28

1 that are in Defendants' possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
2 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

4 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
5 **MESSAGES**) reflecting the **initial sale of Metacard NFTs**, including records of
6 how many NFTs were sold, the price of each NFT, **total funds raised** (approximately
7 \$23 million), and identification of the bank accounts or cryptocurrency wallets where
8 the proceeds were deposited. Include transaction records (such as ETH wallet
9 transactions) and any summaries or spreadsheets of sales results.

10 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

11 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
12 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
13 "all" Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
14 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
15 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
16 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
17 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
18 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
19 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
20 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
21 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
22 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
23 produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
25 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants'
26 possession, custody, or control sufficient to show how many Metacard NFTs were
27 sold in the initial sale, the price of each Metacard, the total funds raised, and the bank
28 accounts or cryptocurrency wallets where the sale proceeds were deposited.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

2 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** showing how the proceeds from the Metocard
3 NFT sales were used or distributed. This should include bank statements, crypto
4 wallet transaction logs, accounting ledgers, and records of any **transfers or**
5 **payments** of those funds – whether to Defendants, to other individuals, or to third-
6 party vendors. (For example, documents evidencing payments to Kyle Forgeard,
7 John Shahidi, or any entity controlled by them from the NFT sale proceeds.)

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

9 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
10 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
11 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
12 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
13 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
14 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
15 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
16 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
17 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
18 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
19 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
20 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
21 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
23 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
24 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
25 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

26 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:**

27 All internal or external financial statements, budgets, or financial reports
28 related to the Metocard project or any Defendant entity involved (e.g. profit-and-loss

1 statements for Metacard, LLC or Nelk USA, Inc., budgets outlining planned use of
2 NFT revenue, or projections given to any stakeholders). Include any documents
3 showing planned allocation of funds (such as if certain amounts were earmarked for
4 events, product development, marketing, etc.).

5 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 7:**

6 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
7 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
8 “all internal or external financial statements, budgets, or financial reports related to
9 the Metacard project or any Defendant entity involved.” Defendants further object to
10 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not
11 proportional to the needs of the case, including to the extent it seeks documents
12 relating to “any Defendant entity involved” unrelated to the Metacard project.
13 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
14 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
15 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
16 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
17 Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this
18 Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and therefore
19 equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are duplicative
20 or cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to
21 Plaintiff by other sources.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
23 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
24 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
25 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

26 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 8:**

27 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
28 **MESSAGES**) sufficient to show any **distribution of profits or compensation**

1 derived from the Metacard project's funds to the Defendants or others. This includes
2 records of salaries, bonuses, dividends, profit-sharing, draws, or any other form of
3 payment or benefit that any Defendant (or its officers/principals) received from the
4 project's revenue.

5 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 8:**

6 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
7 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
8 "all" Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
9 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
10 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
11 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
12 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
13 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
14 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
15 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
16 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
17 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
18 produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the phrase
19 "derived from the Metacard project's funds," as vague and ambiguous.

20 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
21 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants'
22 possession, custody, or control sufficient to show the distribution of profits from the
23 Metacard sale to Defendants or others.

24 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 9:**

25 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and
26 **TEXT MESSAGES**) related to expenses or investments made to fulfill promised
27 perks or project features.

28

1 For example, receipts, invoices, or contracts for expenditures such as event
2 venue deposits, merchandise produced for NFT holders, development of any
3 promised software or platform, marketing costs specifically tied to promised benefits,
4 etc. (This will show whether and how funds were actually reinvested into the project
5 for the benefit of NFT holders.)

6 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 9:**

7 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
8 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
9 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
10 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
11 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
12 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
13 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
14 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
15 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
16 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
17 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
18 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
19 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the
20 terms “promised perks or project features” as vague and ambiguous.

21 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
22 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
23 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
24 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

25 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 10:**

26 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** showing how any Metacard NFTs or related
27 benefits were allocated.
28

1 This includes lists of initial NFT allocations or a ledger of NFT holdings that
2 identifies any NFTs that were reserved for or later transferred to any Defendant, as
3 well as communications about reserving NFTs for the team or friends. (For example,
4 if certain Metacard tokens were kept by the creators or given away as promotions,
5 those records should be produced.)

6 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 10:**

7 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
8 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
9 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
10 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
11 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
12 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
13 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
14 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
15 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
16 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
17 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
18 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
19 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the
20 term “related benefits” as vague and ambiguous.

21 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
22 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants’
23 possession, custody, or control sufficient to show how the Metacards were allocated.

24 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 11:**

25 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** of marketing and promotional content relating to
26 Metacard, including materials disseminated publicly or internally prepared drafts.
27 This encompasses social media posts (Twitter/X, Instagram, YouTube community
28 posts), YouTube videos or podcast segments promoting Metacard, press releases,

1 email newsletters, advertisements, website pages, and any other promotional
2 documents. Include any content that describes the Metacard NFT, its features, perks,
3 potential benefits to buyers, or any investment/value propositions.

4 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 11:**

5 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
6 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
7 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
8 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
9 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
10 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
11 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
12 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
13 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
14 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
15 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
16 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
17 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

18 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
19 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
20 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
21 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

22 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 12:**

23 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and
24 **TEXT MESSAGES**) the **marketing strategy or plans** for Metacard. This includes
25 internal presentations, strategy decks, calendars, or schedules for promotional
26 campaigns, as well as communications among Defendants or with marketing teams
27 about how to pitch Metacard to the public. (For example, discussions on key selling
28 points, target audiences, timing of announcements, and any “hype” strategy.)

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 12:**

2 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
3 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
4 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
5 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
6 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
7 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
8 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
9 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
10 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
11 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
12 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
13 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
14 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the
15 term “plans” as vague and ambiguous.

16 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
17 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
18 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
19 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 13:**

21 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and
22 **TEXT MESSAGES**) and communications between any Defendant (or their agents)
23 and **third-party promoters or influencers** regarding Metacard. This includes
24 communications with marketing agencies, public relations firms, online promoters,
25 or individuals such as celebrities/influencers (e.g. any outreach to Snoop Dogg or his
26 team regarding promotion or events, collaborations with other brands, etc.). Include
27 any contracts or agreements for promotion and any instructions or materials provided
28 to these promoters about what to say or emphasize.

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 13:**

2 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
3 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
4 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
5 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
6 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
7 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
8 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
9 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
10 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
11 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
12 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
13 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
14 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

15 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
16 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
17 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
18 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

19 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 14:**

20 Any versions of any “roadmap,” white paper, FAQ, or similar informational
21 documentation that was created for the Metacard project. This includes drafts and
22 final versions of documents outlining what buyers would get by purchasing a
23 Metacard, planned phases of the project, future ventures tied to the NFT, or any
24 official list of promised features/perks.

25 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 14:**

26 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
27 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
28 “any versions of any ‘roadmap,’ white paper, FAQ, or similar informational

1 documentation that was created for the Metacard project.” Defendants further object
2 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not
3 proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the
4 extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client
5 privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other
6 applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this
7 Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession,
8 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
9 documents or information are public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or
10 that such documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or
11 information that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

12 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
13 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
14 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
15 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

16 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:**

17 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and
18 **TEXT MESSAGES**) that discuss **Metacard as an investment or lucrative**
19 **opportunity**. This covers any mention of potential financial return, increased resale
20 value, or statements like “this NFT will be a good investment,” whether those
21 statements were ultimately used in public marketing or discussed internally.

22 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 15:**

23 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
24 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
25 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
26 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
27 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
28 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-

1 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
2 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
3 seeks documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants
4 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
5 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
6 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
7 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the
8 term "lucrative opportunity" as vague and ambiguous.

9 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
10 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
11 that are in Defendants' possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
12 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

13 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:**

14 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and
15 **TEXT MESSAGES**) regarding planning and development of the Metacard project's
16 promised ventures or utilities. Produce any project plans, product development
17 documents, timelines, or status reports for the initiatives that were supposed to come
18 with the NFT.

19 For example, documents on planning exclusive events (dates, venues,
20 logistics), developing any members-only platforms or content, organizing the
21 \$250,000 giveaway (rules, structure, intended date), or any business ventures NFT
22 holders were to be involved in (such as plans for a Metacard-holder exclusive
23 business or club).

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 16:**

25 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
26 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
27 "any and all" Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
28 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to

1 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
2 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
3 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
4 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
5 seeks documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants
6 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
7 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
8 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
9 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the
10 term "promised ventures or utilities" as vague and ambiguous.

11 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
12 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
13 that are in Defendants' possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
14 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:**

16 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** identifying the team and personnel involved in
17 executing the Metocard project. This includes lists or directories of individuals
18 (employees, contractors, advisors) who worked on the project, along with their
19 roles/responsibilities (e.g., project manager, community manager, developer, event
20 coordinator).

21 If no formal list exists, any communications or HR documents that shed light
22 on who was tasked with what aspect (for instance, an email assigning tasks or
23 discussing hiring for the project).

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:**

25 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
26 Request as duplicative of Request No. 3. Defendants further object on the grounds
27 that this Request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "any and all"
28 Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the

1 extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of
2 the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
3 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
4 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
5 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
6 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
7 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
8 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
9 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
10 produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the phrase
11 "involved in executing" as vague and ambiguous.

12 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
13 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants'
14 possession, custody, or control sufficient to show the team and personnel materially
15 involved in executing the Metacard project.

16 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:**

17 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** concerning any third-party partnerships or
18 collaborations intended to provide benefits to Metacard holders.

19 This includes communications or agreements with external entities for things
20 like venue partnerships (for meet-ups/events), merchandise suppliers (for discounted
21 merch programs), other companies involved in "exclusive opportunities" for holders
22 (e.g., collaborations like the "Bored Jerky" venture mentioned as a business
23 opportunity for holders). Include any records of what those partnerships entailed and
24 whether they progressed (for example, a contract or email exchange with a partner
25 detailing how Metacard holders would get special access or equity in a venture).

26 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:**

27 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
28 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks

1 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
2 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
3 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
4 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
5 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
6 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
7 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
8 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
9 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
10 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
11 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

12 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
13 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
14 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
15 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

16 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:**

17 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and
18 **TEXT MESSAGES**) regarding communications related to the development and
19 launch of the NFT itself.

20 For example, documents about the minting process, the smart contract used
21 (and any specific features of it, such as royalty settings or holdbacks), and any
22 platform or technology set up for Metacard holders (like a private online portal,
23 Discord server setup details, or a planned “Metacard app”). This will show the
24 operational side of implementing the NFT sale and any infrastructure for delivering
25 perks (or lack thereof).

26 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:**

27 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
28 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks

1 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
2 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
3 the needs of the case, including to the extent it seeks documents about “the
4 operational side of implementing the NFT sale,” the “minting process,” and “the
5 smart contract used.” Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
6 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
7 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
8 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
9 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
10 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
11 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
12 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
13 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

14 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
15 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, relating to the development
16 and launch of Metacard are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to
17 a reasonable, good faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:**

19 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
20 **MESSAGES**) regarding complaints, inquiries or claims from any Metacard NFT
21 purchaser or holder regarding the Metacard NFT(s).

22 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 20:**

23 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
24 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
25 “all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
26 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
27 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
28 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product

1 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
2 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
3 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
4 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
5 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
6 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
7 produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

8 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
9 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
10 that are in Defendants' possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
11 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 21:**

13 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
14 **MESSAGES**) of customer complaints, inquiries, or expressions of dissatisfaction
15 related to Metacard.

16 Provide logs or compilations of complaints (if the Defendants kept track of
17 issues raised by the community), any internal tracking of refund requests, and any
18 analyses or reports summarizing customer sentiment or public backlash. If the
19 Defendants moderated an online community (like a Discord or forum for Metacard
20 holders), produce any transcripts or chat logs where significant complaints or issues
21 are discussed (especially any where Defendants or their representatives responded
22 with explanations or promises).

23 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 21:**

24 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
25 Request as duplicative of Request No. 20. Defendants further object on the grounds
26 that this Request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "all"
27 Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the
28 extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of

1 the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
2 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
3 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
4 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
5 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
6 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
7 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
8 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
9 produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

10 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
11 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
12 that are in Defendants' possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
13 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 22:**

15 All **DOCUMENTS** related to any refund or buyback program offered to
16 Metacard holders after the sale. This includes any announcements to holders that a
17 refund was available, documentation of the refund process (applications or forms that
18 holders had to fill out), internal communications about setting up the refund program
19 (discussions of offering "refund plus interest", deadlines for opting in, etc.), and
20 records of any refunds actually issued (names or wallet addresses of holders who
21 received a refund, amounts paid, and dates).

22 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 22:**

23 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
24 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
25 "all" Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
26 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
27 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
28 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product

1 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
2 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
3 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
4 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
5 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
6 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
7 produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

8 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
9 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
10 that are in Defendants' possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
11 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

12 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 23:**

13 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
14 **MESSAGES**) reflecting the initial sale of Metocard NFTs, including records of how
15 many NFTs were sold, the price of each NFT, total funds raised (approximately \$23
16 million), and identification of the bank accounts or cryptocurrency wallets where the
17 proceeds were deposited. Include transaction records (such as ETH wallet
18 transactions) and any summaries or spreadsheets of sales results.

19 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 23:**

20 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
21 Request as duplicative of Request No. 5. Defendants further object on the grounds
22 that this Request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "all"
23 Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the
24 extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of
25 the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
26 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
27 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
28 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks

1 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
2 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
3 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
4 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
5 produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
7 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants'
8 possession, custody, or control sufficient to show how many Metacard NFTs were
9 sold in the initial sale, the price of each Metacard, the total funds raised, and the bank
10 accounts or cryptocurrency wallets where the sale proceeds were deposited.

11 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:**

12 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
13 **MESSAGES**) regarding by laws, corporate minutes or intental authority of
14 communications with Metacard holders regarding post-sale updates or changes.

15 For instance, if Defendants sent messages like "We're still working on X
16 feature" or "Due to unforeseen issues, the promised Y will be delayed," produce
17 those communications. Also, if any holders responded to such messages with further
18 questions or threats of legal action and Defendants replied, include those as well.
19 Essentially, any dialogue between Defendants and customers about the project's
20 status, promises, or dissatisfaction should be captured.

21 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:**

22 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
23 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
24 "all" Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
25 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
26 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
27 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
28 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,

1 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
2 documents outside Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
3 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
4 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
5 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
6 produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the term "intental
7 authority," as unclear in meaning, vague, and ambiguous, and to the phrase "post-
8 sale updates or changes," as vague and ambiguous.

9 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
10 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, reflecting communications
11 with Metacard holders regarding post-sale updates or changes that are in Defendants'
12 possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good faith search pursuant to
13 an agreed-upon protocol.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:**

15 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
16 **MESSAGES**) related to any legal compliance efforts or advice sought for the
17 Metacard project. This includes any non-privileged documents reflecting
18 considerations of compliance with securities laws, gambling/sweepstakes laws (for
19 the giveaway), consumer protection laws (such as California's Consumer Legal
20 Remedies Act or others), or other regulations. For example, produce any final legal
21 memoranda or guidelines given to the team (if outside counsel provided advice that
22 was shared internally) or communications with consultants about regulatory
23 classification of the NFT.

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:**

25 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
26 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents or information protected by the
27 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
28 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 26:**

2 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT**
3 **MESSAGES**) of disclaimers, terms of service, user agreements, or purchase terms
4 provided to or agreed by Metacard purchasers.

5 This includes the text of any terms on the website or platform where the NFTs
6 were sold (e.g., a terms and conditions page or popup), any disclaimer language about
7 what the NFT does or does not guarantee, and any updates to those terms over time.
8 If the sale platform (like a website or Open Sea listing) had written descriptions,
9 produce those descriptions as well, particularly if they contain cautionary language
10 or conditional language about the perks.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 26:**

12 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
13 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
14 “all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to
15 the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs
16 of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
17 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
18 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
19 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
20 documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
21 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
22 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
23 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
24 produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
26 search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants’
27 possession, custody, or control sufficient to show the disclaimers, terms of service,
28 user agreements, or purchase terms provided to or agreed by Metacard purchasers.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 27:**

2 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and
3 **TEXT MESSAGES**) related to corporate minutes, resolutions, by laws or operating
4 agreements pertaining to the authorization to operate the Metacard project.

5 Also, any meeting minutes or resolutions of **NELK** that reference the
6 Metacard project (for instance, board meeting minutes approving the NFT launch or
7 allocating funds).

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 27:**

9 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
10 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
11 “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this
12 Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to
13 the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
14 seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-
15 product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege,
16 protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it
17 seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants
18 further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are
19 public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or
20 information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have
21 already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the
22 phrase “pertaining to the authorization to operate the Metacard project” as vague and
23 ambiguous.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
25 search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request
26 that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good
27 faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

28

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 28:**

2 Any and all **DOCUMENTS** with or submissions to regulatory authorities
3 regarding the Metacard NFT project. This includes any inquiries received from
4 agencies (SEC, state Attorney General, FTC, etc.) and the responses, or any proactive
5 filings/notifications the Defendants made (if any). If none exist, that fact will be
6 apparent, but if Defendants were contacted by regulators or sought to register any
7 aspect (like filing something for a sweepstakes permit for the giveaway or a securities
8 exemption), those documents should be produced.

9 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 28:**

10 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
11 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
12 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request because it seeks
13 documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product
14 doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection,
15 or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that it is
16 overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks “any and all” Documents relating
17 to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
18 documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further
19 object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and
20 therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are
21 duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been
22 produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the statement “If
23 none exist, that fact will be apparent,” as Plaintiff’s representation, and Defendants’
24 response to this Request should not be construed as agreement with Plaintiff’s
25 representation.

26 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants state that
27 there are no Documents responsive to this Request.
28

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 29¹ (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
2 28):**

3 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
4 MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by John Shahidi regarding the Metacard NFT
5 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

6 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
7 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
8 sale.

9 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 29 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
10 REQUEST No. 28):**

11 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
12 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
13 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] John Shahidi regarding the Metacard NFT
14 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
15 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
16 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
17 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
18 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
19 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
20 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
21 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
22 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
23 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
24 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
26 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, John Shahidi to the extent such

27 ¹ Plaintiff mistakenly duplicated numbering of certain Requests for Production
28 (e.g., numbering two consecutive Requests for Production "No. 28"). All instances
of incorrect numbering will be corrected, with Plaintiff's original numbering noted
in parentheticals.

1 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
2 to the other Requests.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 30 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
4 29):**

5 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Kyle Forgeard regarding the Metacard NFT
7 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 30 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 29):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Kyle Forgeard regarding the Metacard
16 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
17 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
19 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
20 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
21 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
22 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
23 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
24 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
25 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
26 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
28 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Kyle Forgeard to the extent such

1 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
2 to the other Requests.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31 INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
4 30):**

5 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Sam Shahidi regarding the Metacard NFT
7 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST NO. 30):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Sam Shahidi regarding the Metacard NFT
16 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
17 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
19 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
20 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
21 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
22 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
23 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
24 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
25 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
26 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
28 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Sam Shahidi to the extent such

1 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
2 to the other Requests.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 32 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
4 31):**

5 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Jesse Sebastiani regarding the Metacard NFT
7 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 32 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 31):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Jesse Sebastiani regarding the Metacard
16 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
17 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
19 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
20 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
21 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
22 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
23 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
24 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
25 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
26 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
28 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Jesse Sebastiani to the extent such

1 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
2 to the other Requests.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 33 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
4 32):**

5 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Stephen DeLeonardis regarding the Metacard
7 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 33 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 32):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Stephen DeLeonardis regarding the
16 Metacard NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request
17 on the basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable
18 particularity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
19 documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants
20 further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information
21 protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common
22 interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
23 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
24 Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this
25 Request to the extent that such documents or information are duplicative or
26 cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff
27 by other sources.

28 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Stephen DeLeonardis to the extent
2 such Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in
3 response to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 34 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
5 33):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Arthur Kulik regarding the Metacard NFT
8 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

9 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
10 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
11 sale.

12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 34 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
13 REQUEST No. 33):**

14 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
15 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
16 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Arthur Kulik regarding the Metacard NFT
17 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
18 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
19 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
20 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
21 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
22 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
23 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
24 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
25 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
26 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
27 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

28 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Arthur Kulik to the extent such
2 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
3 to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 35 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
5 34):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Alex DiTommaso regarding the Metacard NFT
8 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

9 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
10 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
11 sale.

12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 35 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
13 REQUEST No. 34):**

14 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
15 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
16 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Alex DiTommaso regarding the Metacard
17 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
18 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
19 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
20 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
21 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
22 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
23 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
24 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
25 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
26 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
27 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

28 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Alex DiTommaso to the extent such
2 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
3 to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
5 35):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Drew Hill regarding the Metacard NFT Project
7 and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST NO. 35):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Drew Hill regarding the Metacard NFT
16 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
17 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
19 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
20 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
21 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
22 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
23 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
24 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
25 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
26 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Drew Hill to the extent such
2 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
3 to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 37 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
5 36):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Phil Front regarding the Metacard NFT Project
7 and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 37 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 36):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Phil Front regarding the Metacard NFT
16 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
17 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
19 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
20 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
21 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
22 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
23 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
24 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
25 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
26 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Phil Front to the extent such
2 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
3 to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 38 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
5 37):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Lauren Avery regarding the Metacard NFT
8 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

9 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
10 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
11 sale.

12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 38 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
13 REQUEST No. 37):**

14 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
15 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
16 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Lauren Avery regarding the Metacard
17 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
18 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
19 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
20 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
21 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
22 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
23 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
24 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
25 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
26 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
27 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

28 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Lauren Avery to the extent such
2 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
3 to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 39 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
5 38):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Adrian Verdault regarding the Metacard NFT
8 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

9 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
10 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
11 sale.

12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 39 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
13 REQUEST No. 38):**

14 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
15 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
16 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Adrian Verdault regarding the Metacard
17 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
18 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
19 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
20 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
21 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
22 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
23 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
24 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
25 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
26 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
27 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

28 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Adrian Verdault to the extent such
2 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
3 to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
5 39):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Matt Ellis regarding the Metacard NFT Project
7 and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST NO. 39):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
15 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Matt Ellis regarding the Metacard NFT
16 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
17 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
19 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
20 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
21 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
22 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
23 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
24 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
25 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
26 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will

1 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Matt Ellis to the extent such
2 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
3 to the other Requests.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 41 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
5 40):**

6 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Jason Erne regarding the Metacard NFT Project
7 and/or Bored Jerky.

8 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
9 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
10 sale.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 41 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 40):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object
14 to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because
15 it seeks "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Jason Erne regarding the
16 Metacard NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request
17 on the basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable
18 particularity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
19 documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants
20 further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information
21 protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common
22 interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
23 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
24 Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this
25 Request to the extent that such documents or information are duplicative or
26 cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff
27 by other sources.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Jason Erne to the extent such
3 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
4 to the other Requests.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 42 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 41):**

7 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
8 MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Eric Cadieux regarding the Metacard NFT
9 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

10 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
11 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
12 sale.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 42 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST No. 41):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Eric Cadieux regarding the Metacard NFT
18 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
19 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
21 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
22 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
23 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
24 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
25 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
26 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
27 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
28 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Eric Cadieux to the extent such
3 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
4 to the other Requests.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 43 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 42):**

7 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
8 MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Salim Sirur regarding the Metacard NFT
9 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

10 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
11 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
12 sale.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 43 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST NO. 42):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Salim Sirur regarding the Metacard NFT
18 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
19 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
21 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
22 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
23 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
24 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
25 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
26 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
27 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
28 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Salim Sirur to the extent such
3 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
4 to the other Requests.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 44 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 43):**

7 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
8 MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Aaron Steinberg regarding the Metacard NFT
9 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

10 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
11 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
12 sale.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 44 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST No. 43):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Aaron Steinberg regarding the Metacard
18 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
19 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
21 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
22 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
23 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
24 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
25 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
26 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
27 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
28 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Aaron Steinberg to the extent such
3 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
4 to the other Requests.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 45 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 44):**

7 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
8 MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Sean Haney regarding the Metacard NFT
9 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

10 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
11 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
12 sale.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 45 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST NO. 44):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Sean Haney regarding the Metacard NFT
18 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
19 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
21 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
22 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
23 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
24 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
25 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
26 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
27 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
28 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Sean Haney to the extent such
3 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
4 to the other Requests.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 46 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 45):**

7 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Gabriel Poncio regarding the Metacard NFT
9 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

10 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
11 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
12 sale.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 46 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST NO. 45):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Gabriel Poncio regarding the Metacard
18 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
19 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
21 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
22 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
23 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
24 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
25 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
26 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
27 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
28 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Gabriel Poncio to the extent such
3 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
4 to the other Requests.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 47 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 46):**

7 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
8 MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Tyler Chaffee regarding the Metacard NFT
9 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

10 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
11 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
12 sale.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 47 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST NO. 46):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Tyler Chaffee regarding the Metacard
18 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
19 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
21 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
22 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
23 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
24 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
25 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
26 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such
27 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
28 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
2 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Tyler Chaffee to the extent such
3 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
4 to the other Requests.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 48 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 47):**

7 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
8 MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Cousin Jay regarding the Metacard NFT Project
9 and/or Bored Jerky.

10 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
11 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
12 sale.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 48 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST No. 47):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
17 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Cousin Jay regarding the Metacard NFT
18 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
19 that the person to whom "Cousin Jay" refers is ambiguous. Defendants further object
20 to this Request because it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable
21 particularity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks
22 documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants
23 further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information
24 protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common
25 interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
26 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
27 Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this
28 Request to the extent that such documents or information are duplicative or

1 cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff
2 by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, “Cousin Jay” to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants’ agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 49 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 48):**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Alex Lawrence regarding the Metacard NFT
10 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

12 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
13 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project’s inception through post-
14 sale.

15 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 49 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
16 REQUEST No. 48):**

17 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
18 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
19 “all” Documents “sent to, or received by[,] Alex Lawrence regarding the Metacard
20 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky.” Defendants further object to this Request on the
21 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
22 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
23 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
24 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
25 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
26 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
27 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession,
28 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such

1 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
2 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Alex Lawrence to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 50 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 49):**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Daryl Boodhoo regarding the Metacard NFT
10 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

11 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
12 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
13 sale.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 50 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
15 REQUEST No. 49):**

16 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
17 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
18 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Daryl Boodhoo regarding the Metacard
19 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
20 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
22 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
23 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
24 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
25 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
26 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
27 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such

1 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
2 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Daryl Boodhoo to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 51 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 50):**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Nafis Etemadi regarding the Metacard NFT
10 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

11 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
12 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
13 sale.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 51 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
15 REQUEST No. 50):**

16 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
17 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
18 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Nafis Etemadi regarding the Metacard
19 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
20 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
22 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
23 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
24 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
25 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
26 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
27 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such

1 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
2 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Nafis Etemadi to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 52 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 51):**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Austin Ermes regarding the Metacard NFT
10 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

11 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
12 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
13 sale.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 52 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
15 REQUEST No. 51):**

16 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
17 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
18 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Austin Ermes regarding the Metacard
19 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
20 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
22 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
23 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
24 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
25 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
26 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
27 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such

1 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
2 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Austin Ermes to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 53 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 52):**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Alberto Morales regarding the Metacard NFT
10 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

11 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
12 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
13 sale.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 53 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
15 REQUEST No. 52):**

16 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
17 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
18 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,"] Alberto Morales regarding the Metacard
19 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
20 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
22 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
23 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
24 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
25 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
26 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
27 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such

1 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
2 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Alberto Morales to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 54 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 53):**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Courtney Lorenz regarding the Metacard NFT
10 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

11 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
12 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
13 sale.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 54 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
15 REQUEST No. 53):**

16 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
17 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
18 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Courtney Lorenz regarding the Metacard
19 NFT Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the
20 basis that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
22 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
23 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
24 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
25 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
26 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
27 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such

1 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
2 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Courtney Lorenz to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 55 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 54):**

9 All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT
MESSAGES**) sent to, or received by Alex Steele regarding the Metacard NFT
10 Project and/or Bored Jerky.

11 This includes emails, text messages, internal chat logs (e.g., Slack or Discord
12 servers used by the team), or memoranda from the project's inception through post-
13 sale.

14 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 55 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
15 REQUEST No. 54):**

16 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
17 Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks
18 "all" Documents "sent to, or received by[,] Alex Steele regarding the Metacard NFT
19 Project and/or Bored Jerky." Defendants further object to this Request on the basis
20 that it fails to identify the requested documents with reasonable particularity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that
22 are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object
23 to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the
24 attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or
25 any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to
26 this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants' possession,
27 custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such

1 documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information
2 that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will
4 produce any Documents sent to, or received by, Alex Steele to the extent such
5 Documents are within the scope of Defendants' agreed-upon production in response
6 to the other Requests.

7 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 56 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
8 54):**

9 True and correct copies of all bank statements for all bank accounts on which
10 **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** are a named account owner,
11 issued from January 1, 2020 to the present time.

12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 56 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
13 REQUEST No. 54):**

14 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
15 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
16 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
17 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
18 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
19 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
20 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

21 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
22 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

23 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 57 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
24 55):**

25 Any and all documents referencing or pertaining to parcels of real property in
26 which **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** had or have an
27 ownership interest between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

28

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 57 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
2 **REQUEST NO. 55):**

3 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
4 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
5 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
6 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
7 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
8 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
9 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
10 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
11 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
12 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
14 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.**
16 **56):**

17 True and correct copies of any and all documents which reference or pertain
18 to all items of personal property in which **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON**
19 **YOUR BEHALF** had an ownership interest, which have a value in excess of
20 \$1,000.00 between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

21 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
22 **REQUEST NO. 56):**

23 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
24 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
25 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
26 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
27 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
28 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or

1 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
2 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
3 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
4 Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this
5 Request to the extent that such documents or information are duplicative or
6 cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff
7 by other sources.

8 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
9 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

10 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
11 57):**

12 Any and all documents referencing or pertaining to all sources of income that
13 **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have had since January 1,
14 2020.

15 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
16 REQUEST NO. 57):**

17 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
18 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
19 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
20 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
21 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
22 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
23 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
24 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
25 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
26 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
28 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 60 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
2 58):**

3 Any and all deeds or title documents granting to **YOU OR ANYONE
4 ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** an ownership interest in any and all items of real
5 property, personal property, or other assets effective between January 1, 2020 and
6 the present time .

7 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 60 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
8 REQUEST No. 58):**

9 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
10 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
11 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
12 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
13 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
14 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
15 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

16 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
17 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

18 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 61 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
19 58):**

20 Any and all promissory notes referencing money, or items of value, owed to
21 **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** between January 1, 2020 and
22 the present time.

23 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 61 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
24 REQUEST No. 58):**

25 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
26 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
27 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
28 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.

1 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
2 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
3 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
5 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 62 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
7 59):**

8 Any and all documents regarding or pertaining to bonds in which **YOU OR
9 ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** held an ownership interest between
10 January 1, 2020 and the present time .

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 62 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 59):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
15 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
16 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
17 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
19 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
20 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
22 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
24 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

25 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 63 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
26 60):**

27 True and correct copies of any and all stock brokerage firm/institution
28 statements issued between January 1, 2020 and the present time for accounts in which

1 **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** are an owner or hold an
2 ownership interest.

3 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 63 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
4 REQUEST No. 60):**

5 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
6 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
7 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
8 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
9 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
10 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
11 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

12 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
13 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

14 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 64 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
15 60):**

16 Any and all documents regarding any and all businesses in which **YOU OR
17 ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** participate, and/or have or had an
18 ownership interest in between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

19 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 64 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
20 REQUEST No. 60):**

21 In addition to their General Objection, Defendants specifically object to this
22 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
23 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
24 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
25 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
26 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
27 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
28 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.

1 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
2 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
4 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

5 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 65 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
6 61):**

7 Any and all documents regarding or pertaining to securities firms or institution
8 accounts in which **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have or
9 had an ownership interest between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

10 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 65 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
11 REQUEST NO. 61):**

12 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
13 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
14 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
15 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
16 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
17 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
18 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
19 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
21 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
23 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

24 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 66 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
25 62):**

26 Any and all documents regarding or pertaining to any and all trusts in which
27 **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** are or have been a settlor,
28 trustee, or beneficiary between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
2 **REQUEST NO. 62):**

3 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
4 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
5 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
6 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
7 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
8 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
9 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
10 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
11 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
12 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
14 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.**
16 **62):**

17 Any and all documents regarding or pertaining to all securities, stocks, bonds,
18 or certificates in which **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have
19 held an ownership interest between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

20 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 67 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
21 **REQUEST NO. 62):**

22 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
23 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
24 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
25 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
26 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
27 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
28 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the

1 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
2 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
3 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
5 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 68 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
7 63):**

8 Any and all documents regarding or pertaining to all insurance policies,
9 pensions and/or annuities in which **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR
10 BEHALF** have had an interest between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 68 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 63):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
15 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
16 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
17 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
19 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
20 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
22 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
24 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

25 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 69 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
26 64):**

27 Any and all documents regarding or pertaining to all property **YOU OR
28 ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have transferred to any other individual

1 or entity since January 1, 2020.

2 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 69 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
3 **REQUEST No. 64):**

4 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
5 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
6 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
7 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
8 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
9 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
10 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
11 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
12 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
13 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

14 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
15 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

16 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 70 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.**
17 **65):**

18 All documents reflecting artistic, literary, copyright, motion picture, theatrical,
19 or other creative property patents, trademarks, or titles in which **YOU OR ANYONE**
20 **ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** had any right or interest to royalties, and/or benefits
21 between January 1, 2020 and the present time .

22 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 70 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
23 **REQUEST No. 65):**

24 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
25 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
26 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
27 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
28 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.

1 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
2 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
3 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
4 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
5 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
7 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

8 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 71 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
9 66):**

10 All bank statements, and all joint bank statements, foreign or domestic, in
11 which **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** has or had an interest
12 between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 71 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
14 REQUEST NO. 66):**

15 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
16 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
17 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
18 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
19 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
21 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
22 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
23 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
24 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
26 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

27
28

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.**
2 **67):**

3 All documents appraising any real or personal property in which **YOU OR**
4 **ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** has had an interest, all safety deposit
5 contents; documents reflecting jewelry, coins, or precious metals in which **YOU OR**
6 **ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** has had any interest and any appraisals
7 of between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 72 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
9 **REQUEST NO. 67):**

10 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
11 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
12 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
13 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
14 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
15 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
16 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
17 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
19 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

20 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
21 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

22 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.**
23 **68):**

24 All documents that show all receipts and disbursements of money made by
25 **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** between the time period of
26 January 1, 2020 and the present time.

27
28

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 73 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
2 **REQUEST NO. 68):**

3 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
4 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
5 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
6 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
7 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
8 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
9 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
10 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
11 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
12 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
14 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.**
16 **69):**

17 All documents reflecting charge accounts, credit card accounts, and lines of
18 credit of **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** opened between
19 January 1, 2003 and the present time.

20 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 74 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
21 **REQUEST NO. 69):**

22 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
23 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
24 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
25 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
26 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
27 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
28 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the

1 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
2 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
3 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
5 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
7 70):**

8 All documents reflecting gifts received by **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON
9 YOUR BEHALF** between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

10 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 75 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
11 REQUEST NO. 70):**

12 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
13 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
14 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
15 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
16 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
17 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
18 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
19 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
20 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
21 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
23 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

24 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 76 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
25 71):**

26 All documents reflecting gifts made by **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON
27 YOUR BEHALF** between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

28

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 76 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
2 **REQUEST No. 71):**

3 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
4 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
5 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
6 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
7 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
8 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
9 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
10 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
11 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
12 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
14 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

15 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 77 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.**
16 **72):**

17 All documents reflecting any policies of insurance where **YOU OR ANYONE**
18 **ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** was an insured, effective between January 1, 2020
19 and the present time.

20 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 77 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
21 **REQUEST No. 72):**

22 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
23 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
24 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
25 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
26 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
27 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
28 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the

1 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
2 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
3 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
5 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

6 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 78 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST NO.
7 73):**

8 All documents reflecting the appropriate status of parent companies, and/or
9 subsidiaries, in which **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** has
10 had any interest between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

11 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 78 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
12 REQUEST No. 73):**

13 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
14 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
15 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
16 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
17 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
18 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
19 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
20 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
21 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
22 Defendants' possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to the term
23 "appropriate status" as vague and ambiguous.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
25 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

26
27
28

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 79 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.**
2 **74):**

3 All federal and state individual, corporate, and partnership tax returns
4 including but not limited to all schedules for all tax returns for **YOU OR ANYONE**
5 **ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** as well as any and all corporations, partnerships,
6 limited liability corporations/partnerships, or trusts in which **YOU OR ANYONE**
7 **ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have had any interest between January 1, 2020 and
8 the present.

9 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 79 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
10 **REQUEST No. 74):**

11 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
12 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
13 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
14 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
15 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
16 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
17 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

18 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
19 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 80 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.**
21 **75):**

22 Copies of all credit applications prepared by **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING**
23 **ON YOUR BEHALF** between January 1, 2013 and the present time.

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 80 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
25 **REQUEST No. 75):**

26 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
27 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
28 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that

1 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
2 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
3 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
4 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
5 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
6 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
7 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

8 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
9 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

10 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 81 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
11 76):**

12 True and correct copies of any of **YOUR OR ANYONE ACTING ON
13 YOUR BEHALF'S** credit reports or credit histories issued between January 1, 2020
14 and the present time.

15 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 81 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
16 REQUEST No. 76):**

17 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
18 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
19 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
20 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
21 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
22 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
23 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
25 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

26
27
28

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 82 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.**
2 **771):**

3 Any and all documents regarding or pertaining to all credit lines/lines of credit
4 **YOU OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have had available to you
5 between January 1, 2020 and the present time.

6 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 82 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
7 **REQUEST No. 771):**

8 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
9 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
10 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
11 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
12 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
13 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
14 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
15 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
16 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
17 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

18 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
19 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

20 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 83 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.**
21 **74):**

22 True and correct copies of all records setting forth **YOUR OR ANYONE**
23 **ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF'S** assets, and earnings filed between January 1,
24 2020 and the present.

25 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 83 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS**
26 **REQUEST No. 74):**

27 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
28 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional

1 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
2 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
3 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
4 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
5 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
6 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
7 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
8 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

9 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
10 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

11 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 84 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
12 75):**

13 All documents relating to any of **YOUR OR ANYONE ACTING ON YOUR
14 BEHALF'S** property held by third parties .

15 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 84 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
16 REQUEST No. 75):**

17 In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
18 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
19 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
20 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
21 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
22 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
23 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
24 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
25 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
26 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
28 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 85 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS REQUEST No.
2 76):**

3 All documents relating to any vested future interest **YOU OR ANYONE
4 ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have in any property or in the payment of money.

5 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION No. 85 (INCORRECTLY NUMBERED AS
6 REQUEST No. 76):**

7 I In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this
8 Request on the grounds that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional
9 to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request on the grounds that
10 it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights.
11 Defendants further object to this Request as overbroad and unduly burdensome.
12 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or
13 information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the
14 common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity.
15 Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside
16 Defendants' possession, custody, or control.

17 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are
18 willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: August 6, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 COOLEY LLP

3 */s/ Brian M. French*

4 BRIAN M. FRENCH (*pro hac vice*)
(bfrench@cooley.com)

5 RONA S. LI (*pro hac vice*)
(rproper@cooley.com)

6 KATHERINE BECHTEL (*pro hac vice*)
(kbechtel@cooley.com)

7 55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2157
Telephone: (212) 479-6000
Facsimile: (212) 479-6275

8
9 WILLIAM K. PAO (252637)
(wpao@cooley.com)

10 ARIANA BUSTOS (345918)
(abustos@cooley.com)
355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 900
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 561-3250
12 Facsimile: (213) 561-3244

13
14 LUKE C. CADIGAN (*pro hac vice*)
(lcadigan@cooley.com)
500 Boylston Street, 14th Floor
15 Boston, MA 02116-3736
Telephone: (617) 937-2300
16 Facsimile: (617) 937-2400

17
18 Attorneys for Defendants John Shahidi, Nelk,
19 Inc., Metacard, LLC, Nelk USA, Inc., and
Kyle Forgeard

PROOF OF SERVICE **(FRCP 5)**

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the Commonwealth of Virginia. I am employed in Reston, Virginia. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Cooley LLP, 11951 Freedom Drive, Reston, Virginia 20190. On the date set forth below I served the documents described below in the manner described below:

- DEFENDANTS NELK, INC., NELK USA, INC. & METACARD, LLC'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF TRENTON SMITH'S REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, SETS ONE THROUGH THREE

- (BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) I am personally and readily familiar with the business practice of Cooley LLP for the preparation and processing of documents in portable document format (PDF) for e-mailing, and I caused said documents to be prepared in PDF and then served by electronic mail to the parties listed below.

John P. Kristensen (224132)
(john@kristensen.law)
120 Santa Barbara Street, Suite C9
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Telephone: (805) 837-2000

Tommy Kherkher
Leigh S. Montgomery
Jarrett L. Ellzey
EKSM, LLP
4200 Montrose Blvd Suite 200
Houston, TX 77006
Telephone: (888) 350-3931
tkherkher@eksm.com
lmontgomery@eksm.com
jellzey@eksm.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Trenton Smith
and Michael Burrow*

**Joshua Sanford
EKSM, LLP**
10800 Financial Centre Parkway
Little Rock, AR 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088
jstanton@eksm.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Trenton Smith
and Michael Burrow*

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of
2 America that the above is true and correct. Executed on August 6, 2025, at Reston,
3 Virginia.



6 Justin E. Royer
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

COOLEY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

NELK, NELK USA & METACARD'S
OBJ. & RESP. TO SMITH'S RFP, SETS 1-3
CASE NO. 8:25-CV-161-FWS-DFM

EXHIBIT 2

1 COOLEY LLP
2 WILLIAM K. PAO (252637)
(wpao@cooley.com)
3 ARIANA BUSTOS (345918)
(abustos@cooley.com)
4 355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 561-3250
Facsimile: (213) 561-3244

6 BRIAN M. FRENCH (*pro hac vice*)
(b french@cooley.com)
7 RONA S. LI (*pro hac vice*)
(rproper@cooley.com)
8 KATHERINE BECHTEL (*pro hac vice*)
(kbechtel@cooley.com)
9 55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2157
10 Telephone: (212) 479-6000
Facsimile: (212) 479-6275

11 LUKE C. CADIGAN (*pro hac vice*)
(lcadigan@cooley.com)
12 500 Boylston Street, 14th Floor
Boston, MA 02116-3736
13 Telephone: (617) 937-2300
14 Facsimile: (617) 937-2400

15 Attorneys for Defendants John Shahidi, Nelk, Inc.,
Metacard, LLC, Nelk USA, Inc., and Kyle Forgeard

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
18 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION**

20 TRENTON SMITH and MICHAEL
BURROW, Individually and on Behalf of
21 All Others Similarly Situated,

22 Plaintiff,
vs.
23 JOHN SHAHIDI, NELK, INC.,
METACARD, LLC, NELK USA, INC.,
24 and KYLE FORGEARD

25 Defendants.

26 Case No. 8:25-cv-161-FWS-DFM

27 **CLASS ACTION**

28 **DEFENDANT NELK, INC.'S
OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES
TO PLAINTIFF TRENTON
SMITH'S INTERROGATORIES,
SET ONE**

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF TRENTON SMITH**

2 **RESPONDING PARTY: DEFENDANT NELK, INC.**

3 **SET NUMBER: ONE (1)**

4 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33, Defendant Nelk, Inc.
5 (“Defendant”) hereby responds to the First Set of Interrogatories (collectively the
6 “Interrogatories” and each individually, an “Interrogatory”) served by Plaintiff Trenton
7 Smith (“Plaintiff”) on July 7, 2025, in the above-captioned action (the “Action”). The
8 responses contained herein are based on information reasonably available to Defendant
9 as of the date of the response. Defendant expressly reserves the right to revise or
10 supplement these responses.

11 **I. GENERAL RESPONSES.**

12 The following General Responses apply to each Interrogatory and are hereby
13 incorporated by reference into the individual responses to each Interrogatory, and shall
14 have the same force and effect as if fully set forth in the individual response to each
15 Interrogatory.

16 1. Defendant’s responses to the Interrogatories are made to the best of
17 Defendant’s present knowledge, information, and belief. These responses are at all
18 times subject to such additional or different information that discovery or further
19 investigation may disclose and, while based on the present state of Defendant’s
20 recollections, are subject to such refreshing of recollection, and such additional
21 knowledge of facts, as may result from Defendant’s further discovery or investigation.

22 2. Defendant reserves the right to make any use of, or to introduce at any
23 hearing and at trial, documents responsive to the Interrogatories but discovered
24 subsequent to the date of these responses, including, but not limited to, any documents
25 obtained in discovery herein.

1 3. The provision of a response to any of these Interrogatories does not
2 constitute a waiver of any objection regarding the use of said response in these
3 proceedings. Defendant reserves all objections or other questions as to the competency,
4 relevance, materiality, privilege, or admissibility as evidence in any subsequent
5 proceeding or hearing or trial of this or any other action for any purpose whatsoever of
6 these responses and any document or thing produced in response to the Interrogatories.

7 4. By disclosing information in response to Plaintiff's Interrogatories and/or
8 producing documents in response to Plaintiff's Interrogatories, Defendant does not
9 admit that any definition provided or assertion made by Plaintiff is either factually
10 correct or legally binding upon Defendant, and such information and/or documents do
11 not waive any of Defendant's objections.

12 5. Defendant reserves the right to seek relief and a protective order pursuant
13 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26, notwithstanding any responses Defendant has
14 provided herein.

15 6. Discovery is ongoing, and Defendant expressly reserves the right to
16 supplement or amend any response to any Interrogatory.

17 7. Defendant reserves the right to object on any ground at any time to such
18 other or supplemental interrogatories as Plaintiff may at any time propound involving
19 or relating to the subject matter of these Interrogatories.

20 **II. GENERAL OBJECTIONS.**

21 The General Objections set forth below apply to the Interrogatories generally.
22 Unless otherwise stated, the General Objections shall have the same force and effect as
23 if set forth in full in response to each Interrogatory. Any response to an Interrogatory is
24 made subject to the General Objections.

25 1. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
26 seek to impose burdens or obligations on Defendant that are broader than, inconsistent
27 with or not authorized under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of
28 the United States District Court for the Central District of California, other applicable

1 rules or laws, the Stipulated Protective Order to be entered in this Action, the discovery
2 protocol to be agreed upon by the parties, or any other order entered by the Court in or
3 applicable to, this Action (the “Applicable Rules”). Subject to and without waiving any
4 objections, in responding to these Interrogatories Defendant will construe the
5 Interrogatories in accordance with the Applicable Rules.

6 2. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories on the grounds that they
7 seek information protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, work-
8 product doctrine, common interest privilege, joint defense privilege, or any other
9 applicable privilege, protection, exemption, or immunity from discovery afforded under
10 any applicable statute, rule, regulation, or the common law (“Privileged Information”).
11 Defendant claims such privileges and protections to the extent implicated by the
12 Interrogatories and excludes privileged or protected information from its responses to
13 the Interrogatories. Any disclosure of such privileged or protected information in
14 response to the Interrogatories is inadvertent and not intended to waive those privileges
15 and protections. If information containing or reflecting Privileged Information is
16 inadvertently disclosed by Defendant, Plaintiff will not rely on it. Defendant expressly
17 reserves the right to object at any stage of this Action to the introduction into evidence
18 of Privileged Information.

19 3. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
20 seek information protected by its privacy rights or the privacy rights of other defendants
21 in this Action and/or third parties. Any disclosure of such information in response to
22 the Interrogatories is inadvertent and not intended to waive those protections.
23 Defendant reserves the right to demand that Plaintiff sequester any such information
24 consistent with the Applicable Rules.

25 4. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories on the grounds that they
26 seek information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the Action or to any claims
27 or defenses at issue in the Action.

28 5. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories on the grounds that

1 they seek information that is not proportional to the needs of the case.

2 6. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
3 seek information that is cumulative or duplicative.

4 7. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
5 are vague, ambiguous, or fail to describe the requested information with reasonable
6 particularity, on the grounds that such failure impermissibly requires Defendant to
7 speculate as to the information Plaintiff seeks.

8 8. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
9 seek “all” information concerning a matter, on the grounds that such Requests are
10 unreasonable, unduly burdensome, duplicative, cumulative, and seek irrelevant
11 information. To the extent that information is provided in response to such
12 Interrogatories, it will be limited to information that is appropriately discoverable and
13 proportional to the needs of the Action.

14 9. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
15 purport to impose an obligation to disclose any information that is newly received after
16 the receipt of the Interrogatories, because efforts to disclose such information would be
17 unduly burdensome and require unreasonable expense.

18 10. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that they
19 purport to require Defendant to draw subjective or legal conclusions, or are predicated
20 on subjective or legal conclusions or arguments. Subject to and without waiving any
21 objection, Defendant states that any response or provision of information in response
22 to the Interrogatories is not intended to provide, and shall not constitute or be construed
23 as providing, an admission concerning any of the terms used in the Interrogatories.

24 11. Defendant objects generally to the Interrogatories to the extent that the
25 Interrogatories contain inaccurate, incomplete or misleading descriptions of the facts,
26 persons, relationships, or events underlying the Action. Defendant further objects to the
27 Interrogatories to the extent that they assume the existence of facts that do not exist or
28 the occurrence of events that did not take place. Any response or provision of

1 information in response to the Interrogatories is not intended to provide, and shall not
2 constitute or be construed as providing, an admission that any factual predicates stated
3 in the Interrogatories are accurate.

4 12. Defendant will disclose information only in accordance with the
5 Applicable Rules.

6 13. A response by Defendant that it will disclose information in response to
7 a specific Interrogatory shall not be interpreted as an affirmation that such information
8 in fact exists or that it is within Defendant's possession, custody, or control. Such a
9 response is merely intended to reflect that if responsive information exists, and is within
10 Defendant's possession, custody, or control, Defendant will disclose such information
11 in response to the specific Interrogatory in accordance with the Applicable Rules.

12 14. Defendant responds to these Interrogatories to the best of its present
13 knowledge and reserves the right to revise, correct, amend and/or supplement its
14 objections and responses to the Interrogatories.

15 15. Defendant's counsel is available to meet and confer at a mutually
16 agreeable time regarding the appropriate scope of any Interrogatories to which
17 Defendant has objected. To the extent the parties reach agreement on any different or
18 further disclosure in response to such Interrogatory, Defendant will endeavor to provide
19 responsive information within a reasonable time following such agreement.

20 **III. OBJECTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONS.**

21 Plaintiff's Interrogatories do not contain any instructions.

22 **IV. OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS.**

23 Plaintiff's Interrogatories do not contain any definitions.

24

25

26

27

28

1 **V. SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES.**

2 Without waiving or limiting in any manner any of the foregoing General
3 Objections, but rather incorporating them into each of the following responses to the
4 extent applicable, Defendant Nelk, Inc. responds to the specific Interrogatories in
5 Plaintiff's Interrogatories, Set One:

6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

7 Please state the name and, if known, the address, the email address and telephone
8 number of each individual likely to have discoverable information, along with the
9 subject of that information, related to the allegations in the operative Complaint and/or
10 Answer(s) to the Complaint.

11 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

12 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant
13 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome,
14 and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this
15 Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the
16 attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

17 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds that
18 the individuals listed below were primarily responsible for the Metocard program and
19 are likely to have information related to the allegations in the operative Complaint.

Name	Role	Contact
John Shahidi	President	jhs@fullsend.com
Kyle Forgeard	Owner/CEO	kyle@fullsend.com
Sam Shahidi	COO	sammy@fullsend.com
Drew Hill	Director of Operations	drew@fullsend.com
Roland Shen	Web Development	roland@happydad.com
Alan Ardalani	Accounting	alan@shots.com
Jennifer Jaeger	Operations	jenn@fullsend.com

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

2 Please identify each individual and, if known, the address, the email address and
3 telephone number of every person who was involved with the
4 inception/development/marketing/sales/information technology for Metacard and/or
5 Bored Jerky, including a short summary of their role.

6 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

7 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant
8 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome,
9 and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this
10 Interrogatory as duplicative of Interrogatory No. 1. Defendant further objects to this
11 Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the
12 attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant refers to its
14 response to Interrogatory No. 1 above.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

16 Please identify each purchaser of a Metacard, NFT and, if known, their address,
17 the email address and telephone number.

18 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

19 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant
20 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information outside of its
21 possession, custody, or control. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as overly
22 broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant
23 further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose
24 information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds that
26 it does not have the necessary knowledge or information to identify the identity of each
27 Metacard purchaser or their contact information. Metacard purchases were conducted
28 through cryptocurrency wallets.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

2 Please **IDENTIFY ALL BANK ACCOUNTS** on which **YOU OR ANYONE**
3 **ELSE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** is a named account owner since January 1,
4 2020.

5 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

6 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant
7 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is irrelevant or
8 not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory
9 on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable
10 privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad and unduly
11 burdensome. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks
12 information outside Defendant's possession, custody, or control.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant is willing to
14 meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Interrogatory.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

16 Please **IDENTIFY** each source of credit **YOU OR ANYONE ELSE ACTING**
17 **ON YOUR BEHALF** have obtained in the past four years by creditor's name, address
18 and any account numbers.

19 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

20 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant
21 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is irrelevant or
22 not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory
23 on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable
24 privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad and unduly
25 burdensome. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks
26 information outside Defendant's possession, custody, or control.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant is willing to
28 meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Interrogatory.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

2 Please **IDENTIFY ALL SOURCES OF INCOME YOU OR ANYONE ELSE**
3 **ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF** have had since January 1, 2020.

4 (By “**IDENTIFY ALL SOURCES OF INCOME**”, Plaintiff requests that **YOU**
5 identify the income provider by name, address, and telephone number, and set forth the
6 amount of income **YOU** received by each such income provider.)

7 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY No. 6:**

8 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant
9 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is irrelevant or
10 not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory
11 on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable
12 privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad and unduly
13 burdensome. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks
14 information outside Defendant’s possession, custody, or control.

15 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant is willing to
16 meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Interrogatory.

17 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

18 State the total amount of money or cryptocurrency raised from the sale of
19 Metacard NFTs and provide a detailed breakdown of how those funds were used or
20 distributed. In your answer, include: (a) the total number of NFTs sold and the revenue
21 received (in USD or ETH, specifying the conversion if needed), and (b) for each major
22 category of expenditure or distribution, the amount and purpose.

23 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

24 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant
25 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome,
26 and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this
27 Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates
28 applicable privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent

1 that the requested information is in the public domain and therefore equally accessible
2 to Plaintiff. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to
3 require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product
4 doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds
5 as follows:

6 On January 19, 2022, ten thousand (10,000) Metacard NFTs were sold at the
7 price of approximately .75 Ethereum (“ETH”) per Metacard (the “Metacard Sale”).
8 Defendants raised approximately 7,400 ETH from the sale. Based on the price of ETH
9 at the time of the Metacard Sale, this converted to approximately \$23 million
10 (\$23,000,000) U.S. dollars (“USD”).

11 Of the funds received from the Metacard Sale, most went to the Nelk corporate
12 entities (Nelk USA, Inc. and Metacard, LLC), which paid for events and benefits for
13 Metacard holders. Another portion of the funds went toward compensating individuals
14 who were involved in the operations and/or marketing of Metacard. Finally, another
15 portion of the funds went toward other expenses, such as marketing expenses, server
16 costs, and the domain purchase.

17 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

18 Identify all bank accounts, cryptocurrency wallets, or other financial accounts
19 that held the proceeds from Metacard NFT sales or were used to transact Metacard-
20 related finances. For each account or wallet, provide the name of the financial institution
21 or platform (or blockchain address), the name of the account holder or controller (e.g.,
22 Metacard, LLC account at Bank X, or Ethereum wallet controlled by John Shahidi), and
23 the persons authorized to access or manage those funds. In addition, for each such
24 account, indicate the current balance or disposition of funds if the account was later
25 emptied or closed. (This interrogatory traces where the money went and who had
26 control over it.)

27 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

28 Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant

1 objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome,
2 and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this
3 Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates
4 applicable privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it
5 seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work
6 product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant
7 responds as follows:

8 The ETH from the Metacard Sale was initially received by a contract wallet
9 controlled by Defendant. The ETH was subsequently distributed into various
10 cryptocurrency wallets belonging to the Nelk corporate entities (Nelk USA, Inc. and
11 Metacard, LLC), and to the individuals referenced in the Response to Interrogatory No.
12 7 above as compensation for their involvement in the operations and/or marketing of
13 Metacard. To transact finances relating to Metacard, Defendant either (1) made
14 payments directly from a cryptocurrency wallet belonging to the Nelk corporate entities,
15 or (2) transferred ETH from a cryptocurrency wallet belonging to the Nelk corporate
16 entities to a cryptocurrency exchange such as Coinbase or Kraken in order to exchange
17 the ETH for USD, and subsequently transferred the funds in USD to a bank account
18 belonging to Nelk USA, Inc.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: August 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 COOLEY LLP

3 */s/ Brian M. French*

4 BRIAN M. FRENCH (*pro hac vice*)

5 (bfrench@cooley.com)

6 RONA S. LI (*pro hac vice*)

7 (rproper@cooley.com)

8 KATHERINE BECHTEL (*pro hac vice*)

9 (kbechtel@cooley.com)

10 55 Hudson Yards

11 New York, NY 10001-2157

12 Telephone: (212) 479-6000

13 Facsimile: (212) 479-6275

14 WILLIAM K. PAO (252637)

15 (wpao@cooley.com)

16 ARIANA BUSTOS (345918)

17 (abustos@cooley.com)

18 355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 900

19 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560

20 Telephone: (213) 561-3250

21 Facsimile: (213) 561-3244

22 LUKE C. CADIGAN (*pro hac vice*)

23 (lcadigan@cooley.com)

24 500 Boylston Street, 14th Floor

25 Boston, MA 02116-3736

26 Telephone: (617) 937-2300

27 Facsimile: (617) 937-2400

28 *Attorneys for Defendants John Shahidi, Nelk, Inc., Metacard, LLC, Nelk USA, Inc., and Kyle Forgeard*

VERIFICATION

On behalf of Nelk, Inc., I, Drew Hill, am duly authorized to verify the interrogatory responses contained in the foregoing Defendant Nelk, Inc.'s Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Trenton Smith's Interrogatories, Set One. I have read the foregoing responses, which were prepared with the assistance and advice of others. I reserve the right to make any changes in the answers if it appears that more accurate information is available. Subject to these limitations, the responses to the Interrogatories are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on: August 6, 2025

Drew Hill

Drew Hill
Director of Operations
Nelk, Inc.

PROOF OF SERVICE
(FRCP 5)

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the Commonwealth of Virginia. I am employed in Reston, Virginia. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within Action. My business address is Cooley LLP, 11951 Freedom Drive, Reston, Virginia 20190. On the date set forth below I served the documents described below in the manner described below:

- DEFENDANT NELK, INC.’S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF TRENTON SMITH’S INTERROGATORIES, SET ONE

- (BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) I am personally and readily familiar with the business practice of Cooley LLP for the preparation and processing of documents in portable document format (PDF) for e-mailing, and I caused said documents to be prepared in PDF and then served by electronic mail to the parties listed below.

John P. Kristensen (224132)
(john@kristensen.law)
120 Santa Barbara Street, Suite C9
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Telephone: (805) 837-2000

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Trenton Smith
and Michael Burrow*

Tommy Kherkher
Leigh S. Montgomery
Jarrett L. Ellzey
EKSM, LLP

4200 Montrose Blvd Suite 200
Houston, TX 77006
Telephone: (888) 350-3931
tkherkher@eksm.com
lmontgomery@eksm.com
jellzey@eksm.com

**Joshua Sanford
EKSM, LLP
10800 Financial Centre Parkway
Little Rock, AR 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088
jsanford@eksm.com**

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Trenton Smith
and Michael Burrow*

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of
2 America that the above is true and correct. Executed on August 6, 2025, at Reston,
3 Virginia.

4 
5

6 Justin E. Royer
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 3



August 14, 2025

Via Email

Brian M. French (b french@cooley.com)
Rona S. Li (rproper@cooley.com)
Katherine Bechtel (kbechtel@cooley.com)
Luke Cadigan (lcadigan@cooley.com)
William K. Pao (wpao@cooley.com)
Ariana Bustos (abustos@cooley.com)

Cooley LLP

55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2157

REQUEST FOR MEET & CONFER RE: L.R. 37-1 CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS THE DEFENDANTS' DEFECTIVE RESPONSES TO CERTAIN INTERROGATORIES

Re: Smith v. Shahidi, Nek USA, Inc. et al.

Dear Counsel:

This correspondence is sent pursuant to L.R. 37-1 pertaining to just some of Defendants' Defective Responses to Interrogatories. L.R. 37-1 requires a meaningful meet and confer occur by August 25, 2025. We are seeking to discuss the responses by the individual defendants to interrogatories numbers one (1) and two (2). These were also served on the corporate defendants. We also are seeking to discuss the defective responses to interrogatories 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8.

General and Boilerplate Objections Are Improper and Need to Be Removed

The responses are couched in numerous general objections, and then boilerplate objections.

Before we discuss the specific responses, we need to discuss the general and boilerplate objections. First, there were no declarations or evidence supporting the objections. *See, e.g., A. Farber & Partners, Inc. v. Garber*, 234 F.R.D. 186, 188 (C.D. Cal. 2006) (“[G]eneral or boilerplate objections such as ‘overly burdensome and harassing’ are improper—especially when a party fails to submit any evidentiary declarations supporting such objections.... Similarly, boilerplate relevancy objections, without setting forth any explanation or argument why the requested documents are not relevant, are improper.”); *Tubio v. Adidas America, Inc.*, 2023 WL 9420334 *3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2023); *Duran v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 258 F.R.D. 375, 379 (C.D. Cal. 2009); *Paulsen v. Case Corp.*, 168 F.R.D. 285, 289 (C.D.Cal.1996);

Defendants need to supplement their responses without the general and boilerplate objections.

INTERROGATORY No. 1:

Please state the name and, if known, the address, the email address and telephone number of each individual likely to have discoverable information, along with the subject of that information, related to the allegations in the operative Complaint and/or Answer(s) to the Complaint.

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds that the individuals listed below were primarily responsible for the Metocard program and are likely to have information related to the allegations in the operative Complaint.

Name	Role	Contact
John Shahidi	President	jhs@fullsend.com
Kyle Forgeard	Owner/CEO	kyle@fullsend.com
Sam Shahidi	COO	sammy@fullsend.com
Drew Hill	Director of Operations	drew@fullsend.com
Roland Shen	Web Development	roland@happydad.com
Alan Ardalan	Accounting	alan@shots.com
Jennifer Jaeger	Operations	jenn@fullsend.com

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The interrogatory seeks the identification of witnesses with relevant information to the claims in the case. It seeks the identification of all witnesses, not just the ones you want to testify. Also, we need addresses for non directors.

Lastly, what attorney client privilege magic conjures up the refusal to identify witnesses? We are all ears to figure that out.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Please identify each individual and, if known, the address, the email address and telephone number of every person who was involved with the inception/development/marketing/sales/information technology for Metocard and/or Bored Jerky, including a short summary of their role.

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional

August 14, 2025

3 | Page

to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as duplicative of Interrogatory No. 1. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant refers to its response to Interrogatory No. 1 above.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The interrogatory seeks the identification of witnesses with relevant information to the claims in the case. It seeks the identification of all witnesses, not just the ones you want to testify. Also, we need addresses for non directors.

Lastly, what attorney client privilege magic conjures up the refusal to identify witnesses? We are all ears to figure that out.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

Please identify each purchaser of a Metocard, NFT and, if known, their address, the email address and telephone number.

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information outside of its possession, custody, or control. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds that it does not have the necessary knowledge or information to identify the identity of each Metocard purchaser or their contact information. Metocard purchases were conducted through cryptocurrency wallets.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The general objections are non-sense. Also, if you have any information, they need to be produced.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Please IDENTIFY ALL BANK ACCOUNTS on which YOU OR ANYONE ELSE ACTING ON YOUR BEHALF is a named account owner since January 1, 2020.

August 14, 2025

4 | Page

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information outside Defendant's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Interrogatory.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

We are trying to follow the money.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

State the total amount of money or cryptocurrency raised from the sale of Metocard NFTs and provide a detailed breakdown of how those funds were used or distributed. In your answer, include:(a) the total number of NFTs sold and the revenue received (in USD or ETH, specifying the conversion if needed), and (b) for each major category of expenditure or distribution, the amount and purpose.

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that the requested information is in the public domain and therefore equally accessible to Plaintiff. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows:

On January 19, 2022, ten thousand (10,000) Metocard NFTs were sold at the price of approximately .75 Ethereum ("ETH") per Metocard (the "Metocard Sale"). Defendants raised approximately 7,400 ETH from the sale. Based on the price of ETH at the time of the Metocard Sale, this converted to approximately \$23 million (\$23,000,000) U.S. dollars ("USD").

Of the funds received from the Metocard Sale, most went to the Nelk corporate entities (Nelk USA, Inc. and Metocard, LLC), which paid for events and benefits for Metocard holders. Another portion of the funds went toward compensating individuals who were involved in the operations and/or marketing of Metocard. Finally, another portion of the funds went toward other expenses, such as marketing expenses, server costs, and the domain purchase.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The objections are wholly improper. Attorney client privilege? The objections got to go, and you need to spell out the expenditures in dollar amounts, just like you did for the amount raised.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Identify all bank accounts, cryptocurrency wallets, or other financial accounts that held the proceeds from Metacard NFT sales or were used to transact Metacard-related finances. For each account or wallet, provide the name of the financial institution or platform (or blockchain address), the name of the account holder or controller (e.g., Metacard LLC account at Bank X, or Ethereum wallet controlled by John Shahidi), and the persons authorized to access or manage those funds. In addition, for each such account, indicate the current balance or disposition of funds if the account was later emptied or closed. (This interrogatory traces where the money went and who had control over it.)

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows:

The ETH from the Metacard Sale was initially received by a contract wallet controlled by Defendant. The ETH was subsequently distributed into various cryptocurrency wallets belonging to the Nelk corporate entities (Nelk USA, Inc. and Metacard, LLC), and to the individuals referenced in the Response to Interrogatory No. 7 above as compensation for their involvement in the operations and/or marketing of Metacard. To transact finances relating to Metacard, Defendant either (1) made payments directly from a cryptocurrency wallet belonging to the Nelk corporate entities, or (2) transferred ETH from a cryptocurrency wallet belonging to the Nelk corporate entities to a cryptocurrency exchange such as Coinbase or Kraken in order to exchange the ETH for USD, and subsequently transferred the funds in USD to a bank account belonging to Nelk USA, Inc.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The objections are wholly improper. Attorney client privilege? You need to fully respond, so we can see where the money went.

L.R. 37-1 MEETING WITHIN 10 DAYS

Please let us know when you are free on or before August 25, 2025 for a Zoom. We look forward to seeking to narrow these issues. We intend to diligently prosecute this case.

Regards,



John P. Kristensen

cc: Jarrett Ellzey (via email only)
Josh Sanders (via email only)
Tommy Kherker (via email only)
Leigh Montgomery (via email only)

EXHIBIT 4



August 22, 2025

Via Email

Brian M. French (b french@cooley.com)
Rona S. Li (rproper@cooley.com)
Katherine Bechtel (kbechtel@cooley.com)
Luke Cadigan (lcadigan@cooley.com)
William K. Pao (wpao@cooley.com)
Ariana Bustos (abustos@cooley.com)

Cooley LLP

55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2157

REQUEST FOR MEET & CONFER RE: L.R. 37-1 CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS THE DEFENDANTS' DEFECTIVE RESPONSES TO CERTAIN REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

Re: Smith v. Shahidi, Nek USA, Inc. et al.

Dear Counsel:

This correspondence is sent pursuant to L.R. 37-1 pertaining to just some of Defendants' Defective Responses to Requests for Production. L.R. 37-1 requires a meaningful meet and confer occur by September 2, 2025.

General and Boilerplate Objections Are Improper and Need to Be Removed

The responses are couched in numerous general objections, and then boilerplate objections.

Before we discuss the specific responses, we need to discuss the general and boilerplate objections. First, there were no declarations or evidence supporting the objections. *See, e.g., A. Farber & Partners, Inc. v. Garber*, 234 F.R.D. 186, 188 (C.D. Cal. 2006) (“[G]eneral or boilerplate objections such as ‘overly burdensome and harassing’ are improper—especially when a party fails to submit any evidentiary declarations supporting such objections.... Similarly, boilerplate relevancy objections, without setting forth any explanation or argument why the requested documents are not relevant, are improper.”); *Tubio v. Adidas America, Inc.*, 2023 WL 9420334 *3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2023); *Duran v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 258 F.R.D. 375, 379 (C.D. Cal. 2009); *Paulsen v. Case Corp.*, 168 F.R.D. 285, 289 (C.D.Cal.1996);

Defendants need to supplement their responses without the general and boilerplate objections.

REQUEST No. 1:

Plaintiffs sought insurance documents. These are discoverable. The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided.

REQUEST NO. 2:

Plaintiffs sought all documents regarding the ownership structure of the three corporate defendants. These are discoverable. The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

REQUEST NO. 3:

Plaintiffs sought all documents identifying the roles, responsibilities, and involvement of any individual in the conception, launch, and operation of the Metocard NFT project. This includes organizational charts, internal memos, or communications describing who was in charge of finances, marketing, project development, customer relations, and other operational aspects. These are discoverable. The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

REQUEST NOS. 4 TO 28:

Zero documents were produced. The objections were meritless. They were all reasonably particularized. Despite the objections, there is no privilege log, and no declaration supporting those objections.

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

REQUESTS SEEKING METACARD OR BORED JERKY DOCUMENTS FROM SPECIFIC INDIVIDUALS:

Requests 29 to 54 sought documents, including electronic information sent to or from specific individuals about the Metocard NFT project and the Bored Jerky plan. Zero documents were produced. The objections were meritless. They were all reasonably particularized. Despite the objections, there is no privilege log, and no declaration supporting those objections.

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

REQUESTS SEEKING FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS

Plaintiffs are trying to follow the money. They were all reasonably particularized. Despite the objections, there is no privilege log, and no declaration supporting those objections.

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

L.R. 37-1 MEETING WITHIN 10 DAYS

Please let us know when you are free on or before September 2, 2025 for a Zoom. We look forward to seeking to narrow these issues. We intend to diligently prosecute this case.

Regards,



John P. Kristensen

cc: Jarrett Ellzey (via email only)
Josh Sanders (via email only)
Tommy Kherker (via email only)
Leigh Montgomery (via email only)

EXHIBIT 5



September 1, 2025

Via Email

Brian M. French (b french@cooley.com)
Rona S. Li (rproper@cooley.com)
Katherine Bechtel (kbechtel@cooley.com)
Luke Cadigan (lcadigan@cooley.com)
William K. Pao (wpa o@cooley.com)
Ariana Bustos (abustos@cooley.com)

Cooley LLP
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2157

FOLLOW UP ON REQUEST FOR MEET & CONFER RE: L.R. 37-1 CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS THE DEFENDANTS' DEFECTIVE RESPONSES TO CERTAIN REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

Re: Smith v. Shahidi, Nelk USA, Inc. et al.

Dear Counsel:

This correspondence is a follow up to our August 22, 2025 request sent pursuant to L.R. 37-1 pertaining to just some of Defendants' Defective Responses to Requests for Production. L.R. 37-1 requires a meaningful meet and confer occur by September 2, 2025.

General and Boilerplate Objections Are Improper and Need to Be Removed

We have provided Defendants in writing three times with case law from the Central District that general objections and boilerplate objections are improper and will be overruled. This infects each and every response to the requests for production. Furthermore, the following case law should provide an incentive:

An entity that withholds discovery materials based on a privilege must provide sufficient information (i.e., a privilege log) to enable the requesting party to evaluate the applicability of the privilege or other protection. Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(5); see Clarke v. American Commerce Nat'l Bank, 974 F.2d 127, 129 (9th Cir. 1992). Failure to provide sufficient information may constitute a waiver of the privilege. See Eureka Financial Corp. v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co., 136 F.R.D. 179, 182-83 (E.D. Cal. 1991) (a "blanket objection" to each document on the ground of attorney-client privilege with no further description is clearly insufficient); Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. v. West, 748 F.2d 540, 542 (10th Cir. 1984) (attorney-client privilege waived when defendant did not make a timely and sufficient showing that the documents were protected by privilege).

It's been over a month, and we have no privilege log, no declaration supporting a single objection to date. Plaintiff contends those objections have now been waived.

REQUEST No. 1:

All **DOCUMENTS** including any insurance records, the complete policy (including any addendums or documents identifying additional insureds, etc.) for any policy of insurance through which **YOU** were or might be insured in any manner (for example, primary, pro-rata, or excess liability coverage or medical expense coverage) for the damages, claims, or actions that have arisen out of this matter.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST No. 1:

In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks “all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants are willing to meet and confer with Plaintiff regarding this Request.

LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE IS NECESSARY

Plaintiffs sought insurance documents. These are discoverable. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(iv) (“[a] party must, without awaiting a **discovery** request provide to the other parties ... for inspection and copying under Rule 34, any insurance agreement under which an insurance business may be liable to satisfy all or part of a possible judgment in the action or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy the judgment.”). *See also Johnson v. United States*, 2018 WL 613677688 *1 (C.D. Cal. July 10, 2018) (Compelling insurance policies of non-parties - the requested insurance policies and information are relevant and proportionate subjects that will assist the parties in making informed decisions concerning their claims and defenses.)

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided. In a case with an underlying claim of \$23M, producing any actual insurance policies is not unduly burdensome.

REQUEST No. 2:

All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT MESSAGES**) regarding the ownership/structure of **NELK**, **NELK USA**, and **METACARD, LLC**, including in by-laws, corporate minutes, shareholder percentages and filings with the California Secretary of State or any federal (Canada too), provincial, state or local entity.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 2:

In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks “all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the term “filings” as vague and ambiguous.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants’ possession, custody, or control sufficient to show the ownership and/or corporate structure of Nelk, Inc., Nelk USA, Inc., and Metacard, LLC.

LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE IS NECESSARY

First, the objections, general and boilerplate, need to be withdrawn. The objection that four attorneys at Cooley struggle to grasp what a filing is with a Secretary of State is rich, and so egregious that it may by itself be worthy of section 11 sanctions. At least under the standard defense counsel portends to uphold their adversaries.

Plaintiffs need all responsive documents. The documents regarding the ownership structure of the three corporate defendants is discoverable. “The structure of the corporation is not too complicated for a corporate deponent to be expected to discuss knowledgeably.” *UMG Recordings, Inc. v. Global Eagle Entm’t, Inc.*, 2014 WL 12639323 *3 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2014). See also *Taylor v. Shippers Transport Express, Inc.*, 2013 WL 12114614 5 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2013):

Corporate structures and flow charts are discovery, and not unduly burdensome. To the extent it is not clear from [defendant’s] supplemental response if [defendant] has produced all responsive documents in its possession, custody, or control—i.e., as described by plaintiff, “corporate structure flow charts applicable to the class period”—the Motion to compel a further response is granted. Along with any responsive documents, [defendant] shall provide plaintiff with a declaration, signed under penalty of perjury by a corporate officer or director, which confirms that it has produced all responsive documents in its possession, custody or control. Additionally, to the extent [defendant] claims that, having conducted a thorough search, it has already produced all responsive documents in its possession, custody or control, it shall provide plaintiff with a declaration to that effect, signed under penalty of perjury by a corporate officer or director.

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

REQUEST No. 3:

All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT MESSAGES**) identifying the roles, responsibilities, and involvement of any individual in the conception, launch, and operation of the Metacard NFT project. This includes organizational charts, internal memos, or communications describing who was in charge of finances, marketing, project development, customer relations, and other operational aspects.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST No. 3:

In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks “all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants’ possession, custody, or control sufficient to identify the individuals involved in the conception, launch, and operation of the Metacard project and their respective roles and responsibilities.

LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE IS NECESSARY

Plaintiffs sought all documents identifying the roles, responsibilities, and involvement of any individual in the conception, launch, and operation of the Metacard NFT project. This includes organizational charts, internal memos, or communications describing who was in charge of finances, marketing, project development, customer relations, and other operational aspects. These are discoverable. Who did what for Metacard is basic discovery. There is no declaration saying it is unduly burdensome.

The promised documents have not arrived. Plaintiffs are entitled to enough responsive documents so it is clear who had what roles, responsibilities, and involvement of any individual in the conception, launch, and operation of the Metacard NFT project

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided. *See Hartsock v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, 2014 WL 51237, *3–4 (D.S.C. Jan.7, 2014) (finding no error with the magistrate's judge's Order compelling production of six organizational charts and finding the charts to be necessary for discovering potential witnesses where defendant failed to show that the request was over broad and unduly burdensome) (citing *Stambler v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 2011 WL 10538668, at *8 (E.D.Tex. May 23, 2011) (finding relevant, and compelling production of, organizational charts for multiple departments)) and *Cunningham v. Standard Fire Ins. Co.*, 2008 WL 2902621, at *2 (D.Colo. July 24, 2008) (permitting discovery of organizational charts beyond just the claims department at issue)); *see also Impact, LLC v. United Rentals, Inc.*, 2009 WL 413713, *9 (E.D.Ark. Feb.18, 2009) (granting request for production of current non-privileged organizational charts); *Clearone Commc'n, Inc. v. Chiang*, 2007 WL 4166137, *4 (D.Utah. Nov.20, 2007) (granting request for production of documents sufficient to show the organizational structure of defendant).

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and the responsive documents produced.

REQUEST No. 4:

All agreements or contracts between or among any of the Defendants (including with third parties and vendors) relating to the Metocard project or the FullSend Metocard venture. This includes partnership or joint venture agreements, operating agreements for Metocard LLC, employment or consulting contracts (if any) for individuals working on the project, and any documents delineating authority or decision-making structure for the project.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST No. 4:

In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks “all” agreements or contracts relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources. Defendants further object to the phrase “relating to the Metocard project or the FullSend Metocard venture,” as vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE IS NECESSARY

The contracts related to the Metocard project and venture tells who did what, how much they were paid. It is an easy production to prepare and highly relevant.

REQUEST No. 5:

All **DOCUMENTS** (including, but not limited to, **EMAILS** and **TEXT MESSAGES**) reflecting the initial sale of Metocard NFTs, including records of how many NFTs were sold, the price of each NFT, total funds raised (approximately \$23 million), and identification of the bank accounts or cryptocurrency wallets where the proceeds were deposited. Include transaction records (such as ETH wallet transactions) and any summaries or spreadsheets of sales results.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST No. 5:

In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks “all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will search for and produce responsive non-privileged Documents within Defendants’ possession, custody, or control sufficient to show how many Metocard NFTs were sold in the initial sale, the price of each Metocard, the total funds raised, and the bank accounts or cryptocurrency wallets where the sale proceeds were deposited.

LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE IS NECESSARY

The objections are improper. There has been no privilege log to date. The responsive documents promised must be produced forthwith.

REQUEST No. 6:

Any and all **DOCUMENTS** showing how the proceeds from the Metocard NFT sales were used or distributed. This should include bank statements, crypto wallet transaction

logs, accounting ledgers, and records of any **transfers or payments** of those funds – whether to Defendants, to other individuals, or to third-party vendors. (For example, documents evidencing payments to Kyle Forgeard, John Shahidi, or any entity controlled by them from the NFT sale proceeds.)

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 6:

In addition to their General Objections, Defendants specifically object to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks “any and all” Documents relating to the Request. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents that are irrelevant or not proportional to the needs of the case. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, the common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, protection, or immunity. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that it seeks documents outside Defendants’ possession, custody, or control. Defendants further object to this Request to the extent that such documents or information are public and therefore equally available to Plaintiff, or that such documents or information are duplicative or cumulative of documents or information that have already been produced to Plaintiff by other sources.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendants will search for and produce non-privileged Documents, if any, responsive to the Request that are in Defendants’ possession, custody, or control, subject to a reasonable, good faith search pursuant to an agreed-upon protocol.

LEGAL AND FACTUAL REASONS WHY A FURTHER RESPONSE IS NECESSARY

The objections are improper. There has been no privilege log to date. The responsive documents promised must be produced forthwith.

REQUEST NOS. 7 TO 28:

Zero documents were produced. The objections were meritless. They were all reasonably particularized. Despite the objections, there is no privilege log, and no declaration supporting those objections.

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

September 1, 2025

8 | Page

**REQUESTS SEEKING METACARD OR BORED JERKY DOCUMENTS FROM SPECIFIC INDIVIDUALS:**

Requests 29 to 54 sought documents, including electronic information sent to or from specific individuals about the Metacard NFT project and the Bored Jerky plan. Zero documents were produced. The objections were meritless. They were all reasonably particularized. Despite the objections, there is no privilege log, and no declaration supporting those objections.

Defendants have provided no protocol for production, even though they suggested they would do so.

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided.

REQUESTS SEEKING FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS

Plaintiffs are trying to follow the money. They were all reasonably particularized. Despite the objections, there is no privilege log, and no declaration supporting those objections.

The objections must be waived and a compliant response provided and all responsive documents provided. The protective order provides adequate assurances to protect against any right to privacy.

SEPTEMBER 2, 2025

We look forward to seeing you on September 2, 2025 via Zoom. We look forward to seeking to narrow these issues. We intend to diligently prosecute this case.

Regards,



John P. Kristensen

cc: Jarrett Ellzey (via email only)
Josh Sanders (via email only)
Tommy Kherker (via email only)
Leigh Montgomery (via email only)

EXHIBIT 6



September 3, 2025

Via Email

Brian M. French (b french@cooley.com)

Rona S. Li (rproper@cooley.com)

Katherine Bechtel (kbechtel@cooley.com)

Luke Cadigan (lcadigan@cooley.com)

William K. Pao (wpao@cooley.com)

Ariana Bustos (abustos@cooley.com)

Cooley LLP

55 Hudson Yards

New York, NY 10001-2157

REQUEST FOR FURTHER MEET & CONFER RE: L.R. 37-1 CONFERENCE TO DISCUSS THE DEFENDANTS' DEFECTIVE RESPONSES TO CERTAIN INTERROGATORIES

Re: *Smith v. Shahidi, Nelk USA, Inc. et al.*

Dear Counsel:

This correspondence follows up my meet and confer with Rona and Kate on Friday, August 22, 2025. As I indicated, we need all the general and boilerplate objections withdrawn. Furthermore, we have no declarations regarding any objections. I previously provided that case law. Here it is again.

Rona suggested that our original correspondence was not adequate under L.R. 37-1. There seemed to be a suggestion that we need a citation to a completely identical situation. First, regarding your defective objections, we provided the case law. Pertaining to the other interrogatories, we are providing more here. We look forward to our further meeting on September 9, 2025. We believe you know our positions at this point.

General and Boilerplate Objections Are Improper and Need to Be Removed

The responses are couched in numerous general objections, and then boilerplate objections.

Before we discuss the specific responses, we need to discuss the general and boilerplate objections. First, there were no declarations or evidence supporting the objections. *See, e.g., A. Farber & Partners, Inc. v. Garber*, 234 F.R.D. 186, 188 (C.D. Cal. 2006) (“[G]eneral or boilerplate objections such as ‘overly burdensome and harassing’ are improper—especially when a party fails to submit any evidentiary declarations supporting such objections.... Similarly, boilerplate relevancy objections, without setting forth any explanation are improper.”); *Tubio v. Adidas America, Inc.*, 2023 WL 9420334 *3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2023); *Duran v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 258 F.R.D. 375, 379 (C.D. Cal. 2009); *Paulsen v. Case Corp.*, 168 F.R.D. 285, 289 (C.D.Cal.1996).

Defendants need to supplement their responses without the general and boilerplate objections.

September 3, 2025

2 | Page



During the meet and confer on August 22, 2025, the Defendants indicated they are going to keep the objections. Please let us know. We will be seeking to overrule those objections.

Interrogatory No. 2 seeks the identification of specific people who were involved with Metacard and/or Bored Jerky. These are Defendants' employees or agents. The prior meet and confer correspondence said the following.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Please identify each individual and, if known, the address, the email address and telephone number of every person who was involved with the inception/development/marketing/sales/information technology for Metacard and/or Bored Jerky, including a short summary of their role.

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as duplicative of Interrogatory No. 1. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant refers to its response to Interrogatory No. 1 above.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The interrogatory seeks the identification of witnesses with relevant information to the claims in the case. It seeks the identification of all witnesses, not just the ones you want to testify. Also, we need addresses for non directors.

Lastly, what attorney client privilege magic conjures up the refusal to identify witnesses? We are all ears to figure that out.

FURTHER REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The request for witnesses is clearly within the scope of discovery. The interrogatory sought the names of all individuals who were involved with Metacard and/or Bored Jerky, and a short summary of their role.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 provides that a party may obtain discovery "regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). "Information within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be discoverable." *Id.* "Relevancy, for the purposes of discovery, is defined broadly, although it is not without ultimate and necessary boundaries." *Gonzales v. Google, Inc.*, 234 F.R.D. 674, 679-80 (N.D. Cal. 2006).

September 3, 2025

3 | Page



Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1) (requiring production of the name, address, and telephone number of individuals likely to have discoverable information relevant to the disputed facts of a case); Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(1) (“the scope of discovery [includes] ... the identity and location of persons who know of any discoverable matter”); *see also Dixon v. Certainteed Corp.*, 164 F.R.D. 685, 689 (D. Kan. 1996) (requiring disclosure of the addresses and telephone numbers of defendant’s employees, and noting that defendant’s concern that plaintiff would contact the employees outside of defendant’s presence was not “cause to unilaterally disregard its duties of disclosure under Rule 26(a)”).

“Central to the discovery process is the identification of potential witnesses.” *Puerto v. Sup. Ct.*, 158 Cal.App.4th 1242, 1249 (2008). The *Puerto* Court succinctly explained the request for the identity of witness as “[t]his is basic civil discovery.” Id. at 1254.

There was no declaration supporting your boilerplate objections that this request was overly broad, unduly burdensome or not proportional. Plaintiffs are seeking at least \$23M for fraud. The identity of Defendants employees is not a large burden. This is basic civil discovery. “The disclosure of names, addresses, and telephone numbers is a common practice in the class action context.” *Artis*, 276 F.R.D. at 352; *accord Algee v. Nordstrom Inc.*, 2012 WL 1575314, at *4 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2012); *Sandres v. Corr. Corp. of Am.*, 2011 WL 475068, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2011) (“[P]roviding residential telephone numbers and addresses for percipient witnesses is ‘ordinary’ and ‘routine’ and does not constitute a serious invasion of privacy rights.”)

As I explained, this is standard discovery. You do not get to just name relevant witnesses that you want, but need to identify the people with information that we would like to know about. The parties have a dispute. **Defendants need to waive all responses and provide further responses, without objections. Also, we need the addresses and contact information for all non-directors.**

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

Please identify each purchaser of a Metocard, NFT and, if known, their address, the email address and telephone number.

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information outside of its possession, custody, or control. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds that it does not have the necessary knowledge or information to identify the identity of each Metocard purchaser or their contact information. Metocard purchases were conducted through cryptocurrency wallets.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The general objections are non-sense. Also, if you have any information, they need to be produced.

FURTHER REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

We are requesting the contact information of the putative class members, if you have them. If you do not, we are requesting the wallet information, as we can use that to contact the putative class members.

All grounds for objection to an interrogatory must be stated “with specificity.” FRCP 33(b)(4). Where an interrogatory is overbroad, the responding party should answer whatever part of the question is proper, object to the balance and provide some meaningful explanation of the basis for the objection. *Mitchell v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 208 FRD 455, 458, fn. 4 (D DC 2002). There was no specificity or declarations.

Discovery of putative class members is routinely provided. Generally, the Ninth Circuit has favored “allowing class contact discovery unless it is apparent that [p]laintiff cannot maintain the action on behalf of the class. *Goundar v. Redfin Corp.*, 2014 WL 12524649, at *2 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2014). Indeed, “the better and more advisable practice for a District Court to follow is to afford the litigants an opportunity to present evidence as to whether a class action is maintainable.” *Vinole*, 571 F.3d at 942 (quoting *Doninger v. Pac. Nw. Bell, Inc.*, 564 F.2d 1304, 1313 (9th Cir. 1977)) (internal quotations omitted). “And, the necessary antecedent to the presentation of evidence is, in most cases, enough discovery to obtain the material, especially when the information is within the sole possession of the defendant.” *Doninger*, 564 F.2d at 1313 (citations omitted); see also *Faraji v. Target Corp.*, 2017 WL 8292781 (C.D. Cal. April 28, 2017).

If you are aware of certain putative class members (maybe they showed up at an event, or contacted you), then we are entitled to that information. If you only have the wallet address, please provide that. Each wallet address is uniquely identified and linked to an email address and bank account, ensuring that, like an email address, it is specific to a particular user. *CipherBlade, LLC v. CipherBlade, LLC*, 2024 WL 69164 (D. Alaska Jan. 5, 2024) (permitting service of summons via NFT and blockchain to digital wallets.). If it is good for jurisdictional purposes, it is good for us.

Further, notice has been approved to similar claims. See *DraftKings*

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

State the total amount of money or cryptocurrency raised from the sale of Metocard NFTs and provide a detailed breakdown of how those funds were used or distributed. In your answer, include:(a) the total number of NFT's sold and the revenue received (in USD or ETH, specifying the conversion if needed), and (b) for each major category of expenditure or distribution, the amount and purpose.

DEFECTIVE RESPONSE INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Defendant incorporates herein the General Objections stated above. Defendant objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks sensitive personal information and violates applicable privacy rights. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that the requested information is in the public domain and therefore equally accessible to Plaintiff. Defendant further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks

September 3, 2025

5 | Page



to require it to disclose information subject to the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows:

On January 19, 2022, ten thousand (10,000) Metocard NFTs were sold at the price of approximately .75 Ethereum (“ETH”) per Metocard (the “Metocard Sale”). Defendants raised approximately 7,400 ETH from the sale. Based on the price of ETH at the time of the Metocard Sale, this converted to approximately \$23 million (\$23,000,000) U.S. dollars (“USD”).

Of the funds received from the Metocard Sale, most went to the Nelk corporate entities (Nelk USA, Inc. and Metocard, LLC), which paid for events and benefits for Metocard holders. Another portion of the funds went toward compensating individuals who were involved in the operations and/or marketing of Metocard. Finally, another portion of the funds went toward other expenses, such as marketing expenses, server costs, and the domain purchase.

BRIEF REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

The objections are wholly improper. Attorney client privilege? The objections got to go, and you need to spell out the expenditures in dollar amounts, just like you did for the amount raised.

FURTHER REASONS WHY THE RESPONSE IS DEFECTIVE

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 provides that a party may obtain discovery “regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). “Information within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be discoverable.” *Id.* “Relevancy, for the purposes of discovery, is defined broadly, although it is not without ultimate and necessary boundaries.” *Gonzales v. Google, Inc.*, 234 F.R.D. 674, 679-80 (N.D. Cal. 2006).

We are not seeking that much information. It should be readily available and not difficult to allocate. Plaintiff is not seeking the exact dollar amount at this time. Defendants indicated in their response where the \$23 million went:

Of the funds received from the Metocard Sale, most went to the Nelk corporate entities (Nelk USA, Inc. and Metocard, LLC), which paid for events and benefits for Metocard holders. Another portion of the funds went toward compensating individuals who were involved in the operations and/or marketing of Metocard. Finally, another portion of the funds went toward other expenses, such as marketing expenses, server costs, and the domain purchase.

It appears there are four areas where the \$23 million went: (1) most went to corporate entities; (2) for events and benefits for Metocard holders; (3) toward compensating individuals who were involved in the operations and/or marketing of Metocard; (4) other expenses, such as marketing expenses, server costs, and the domain purchase.

If most went to Nelk corporate entities, which ones, and how much? Also, where did the rest go?



Secondarily, what events and benefits for Metocard holders occurred, and how much?

Third, which individual were compensated for “operations and/or marketing” and how much?

Fourth, how much for other expenses, such as marketing expenses, server costs and the domain purchase.

L.R. 37-1 MEETING WITHIN 10 DAYS

We look forward to our meeting on September 9 and seeking to narrow these issues. We intend to diligently prosecute this case.

Regards,



John P. Kristensen

cc: Jarrett Ellzey (via email only)
Josh Sanders (via email only)
Tommy Kherker (via email only)
Leigh Montgomery (via email only)

EXHIBIT 7

1 COOLEY LLP
2 WILLIAM K. PAO (252637)
(wpao@cooley.com)
3 ARIANA BUSTOS (345918)
(abustos@cooley.com)
4 355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 561-3250
Facsimile: (213) 561-3244

6 BRIAN M. FRENCH (*pro hac vice*)
(bfrrench@cooley.com)
7 RONA S. LI (*pro hac vice*)
(rproper@cooley.com)
8 KATHERINE BECHTEL (*pro hac vice*)
(kbechtel@cooley.com)
9 55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001-2157
10 Telephone: (212) 479-6000
Facsimile: (212) 479-6275

11 LUKE C. CADIGAN (*pro hac vice*)
(lcadigan@cooley.com)
12 500 Boylston Street, 14th Floor
Boston, MA 02116-3736
13 Telephone: (617) 937-2300
14 Facsimile: (617) 937-2400

15 Attorneys for Defendants John Shahidi, Nelk, Inc.,
Metacard, LLC, Nelk USA, Inc., and Kyle Forgeard

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
18 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - SOUTHERN DIVISION**

20 TRENTON SMITH and MICHAEL
BURROW, Individually and on Behalf
21 of All Others Similarly Situated,

Case No. 8:25-cv-161-FWS-DFM

CLASS ACTION

**STIPULATED PROTECTIVE
ORDER**

22 Plaintiff,

23 vs.

24 JOHN SHAHIDI, NELK, INC.,
METACARD, LLC, NELK USA, INC.,
25 and KYLE FORGEARD

26 Defendants.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
897
898
899
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
997
998
999
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1097
1098
1099
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1197
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1297
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1397
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1497
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1597
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1697
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
17

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2 This Stipulated Protective Order shall govern the action entitled *Smith v.*
3 *Shahidi*, Case No. 8:25-cv-00161-FWS-DFM, the (“Action”), filed by Plaintiffs
4 Trenton Smith and Michael Burrow (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) against Defendants
5 John Shahidi, Nelk, Inc., Metocard, LLC, Nelk USA, Inc., and Kyle Forgeard
6 (collectively, “Defendants”) (jointly, the “Parties”).

7 **A. PURPOSES AND LIMITATIONS**

8 Discovery in this Action is likely to involve production of confidential,
9 proprietary, or private information for which special protection from public
10 disclosure and from use for any purpose other than prosecuting this Action may be
11 warranted. Accordingly, the Parties hereby stipulate to and request that the Court
12 enter the following Stipulated Protective Order. The Parties acknowledge that this
13 Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery
14 and that the protection it affords from public disclosure and use extends only to the
15 limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the
16 applicable legal principles. The Parties further acknowledge, as set forth in Section
17 12.3, below, that this Stipulated Protective Order does not entitle them to file
18 confidential information under seal; Civil Local Rule 79-5 sets forth the procedures
19 that must be followed and the standards that will be applied when a party seeks
20 permission from the court to file material under seal.

21 **B. GOOD CAUSE STATEMENT**

22 The Parties believe this case may involve documents, materials, or information
23 that needs special protection from public disclosure and from use for any purpose
24 other than prosecution of this Action is warranted. It may involve confidential and
25 proprietary materials and information consisting of, among other things, the
26 Defendants’ confidential business or financial information, information regarding
27 confidential business practices, or other commercial information (including
28 information implicating privacy rights of third parties) that is generally unavailable

1 to the public, or which may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure
2 under state or federal statutes, court rules, case decisions, or common law. Finally, it
3 may involve inadvertent production of information subject to the attorney-client
4 privilege, attorney work product doctrine, or other similar evidentiary privileges and
5 protections.

6 Accordingly, to expedite the flow of information, to facilitate the prompt
7 resolution of disputes over confidentiality of discovery materials, to adequately
8 protect information the Parties are entitled to keep confidential, to ensure that the
9 Parties are permitted reasonable necessary uses of such material in preparation for
10 and in the conduct of trial, to address their handling at the end of the litigation, and
11 serve the ends of justice, a protective order for such information is justified in this
12 matter. It is the intent of the Parties that information will not be designated as
13 confidential for tactical reasons and that nothing be so designated without a good
14 faith belief that it has been maintained in a confidential, non-public manner, and there
15 is good cause why it should not be part of the public record of this case.

16 **2. DEFINITIONS**

17 2.1 Challenging Party: a Party or Non-Party that challenges the designation of
18 information or items under this Order.

19 2.2 “CONFIDENTIAL” Information or Items: information (regardless of how
20 it is generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things that qualify for protection
21 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).

22 2.3 Counsel: Outside Counsel of Record and House Counsel (as well as their
23 support staff).

24 2.4 Designating Party: a Party or Non-Party that designates information or
25 items that it produces in disclosures or in responses to discovery as
26 “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.”

27 2.5 Disclosure or Discovery Material: all items or information, regardless of
28 the medium or manner in which it is generated, stored, or maintained (including,

1 among other things, testimony, transcripts, and tangible things), that are produced or
2 generated in disclosures or responses to discovery in this matter.

3 2.6 Expert: a person with specialized knowledge or experience in a matter
4 pertinent to the litigation who has been retained by a Party or its counsel to serve as
5 an expert witness or as a consultant in this Action.

6 2.7 "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" Information or Items: information
7 (regardless of how it is generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things belonging
8 to a Designating Party who believes in good faith that the disclosure of such
9 information to another Party or Non-Party would create a substantial risk of serious
10 financial or other injury that cannot be avoided by less restrictive means.

11 2.8 House Counsel: attorneys who are employees of a party to this Action.
12 House Counsel does not include Outside Counsel of Record or any other outside
13 counsel.

14 2.9 Non-Party: any natural person, partnership, corporation, association, or
15 other legal entity not named as a Party to this Action.

16 2.10 Outside Counsel of Record: attorneys who are not employees of a party
17 to this Action but are retained to represent or advise a party to this Action and have
18 appeared in this Action on behalf of that party or are affiliated with a law firm which
19 has appeared on behalf of that party.

20 2.11 Party: any party to this Action, including all of its officers, directors,
21 employees, consultants, retained experts, and Outside Counsel of Record (and their
22 support staffs).

23 2.12 Producing Party: a Party or Non-Party that produces Disclosure or
24 Discovery Material in this Action.

25 2.13 Professional Vendors: persons or entities that provide litigation support
26 services (e.g., photocopying, videotaping, translating, preparing exhibits or
27 demonstrations, and organizing, storing, or retrieving data in any form or medium)
28 and their employees and subcontractors.

1 2.14 Protected Material: any Disclosure or Discovery Material that is
2 designated as “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.”

3 2.15 Receiving Party: a Party that receives Disclosure or Discovery Material
4 from a Producing Party.

5 **3. SCOPE**

6 The protections conferred by this Stipulation and Order cover not only
7 Protected Material (as defined above), but also (1) any information copied or
8 extracted from Protected Material; (2) all copies, excerpts, summaries, or
9 compilations of Protected Material; and (3) any testimony, conversations, or
10 presentations by Parties or their Counsel that might reveal Protected Material.

11 Any use of Protected Material at trial will be governed by the orders of the trial
12 judge. This Order does not govern the use of Protected Material at trial.

13 **4. DURATION**

14 Even after final disposition of this litigation, the confidentiality obligations
15 imposed by this Order will remain in effect until a Designating Party agrees otherwise
16 in writing or a court order otherwise directs. Final disposition will be deemed to be
17 the later of (1) dismissal of all claims and defenses in this Action, with or without
18 prejudice; and (2) final judgment herein after the completion and exhaustion of all
19 appeals, rehearings, remands, trials, or reviews of this Action, including the time
20 limits for filing any motions or applications for extension of time pursuant to
21 applicable law.

Commented [1]: We need to hold copies of our files for 5 years per CA ethics

Commented [2R1]: That shouldn't have any effect on this section of the PO.

Commented [JK3R1]: This is correct. Section is good. JPK

22 Prior to final disposition of this litigation, the provisions of this Stipulated
23 Protective Order may be modified (including, without limitation, with respect to
24 particular information) at any time by stipulation of the parties and approval by order
25 of the Court, or upon motion by a party for good cause shown.

26 **5. DESIGNATING PROTECTED MATERIAL**

27 5.1 Exercise of Restraint and Care in Designating Material for Protection.

1 Each Party or Non-Party that designates information or items for protection
2 under this Order must take care to limit any such designation to specific material that
3 qualifies under the appropriate standards. The Designating Party must designate for
4 protection only those parts of material, documents, items, or oral or written
5 communications that qualify – so that other portions of the material, documents,
6 items, or communications for which protection is not warranted are not swept
7 unjustifiably within the ambit of this Order.

8 If it comes to a Designating Party's attention that information or items that it
9 designated for protection do not qualify for protection, that Designating Party must
10 promptly notify all other Parties that it is withdrawing the mistaken designation.

11 5.2 Manner and Timing of Designations. Except as otherwise provided in
12 this Order (*see, e.g.*, second paragraph of section 5.2(a) below), or as otherwise
13 stipulated or ordered, Disclosure or Discovery Material that qualifies for protection
14 under this Order must be clearly so designated before the material is disclosed or
15 produced.

16 Designation in conformity with this Order requires:

17 (a) For information in documentary form (*e.g.*, paper or electronic documents,
18 but excluding transcripts of depositions or other pretrial or trial proceedings), that the
19 Producing Party affix the legend “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY
20 CONFIDENTIAL” to each page that contains protected material. If only a portion or
21 portions of the material on a page qualifies for protection, the Producing Party also
22 must clearly identify the protected portion(s) (*e.g.*, by making appropriate markings
23 in the margins).

24 A Party or Non-Party that makes original documents or materials available for
25 inspection need not designate them for protection until after the inspecting Party has
26 indicated which material it would like copied and produced. During the inspection
27 and before the designation, all of the material made available for inspection shall be
28 deemed “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.” After the inspecting

1 Party has identified the documents it wants copied and produced, the Producing Party
2 must determine which documents, or portions thereof, qualify for protection under
3 this Order. Then, before producing the specified documents, the Producing Party
4 must affix the “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” legend to each
5 page that contains Protected Material. If only a portion or portions of the material on
6 a page qualifies for protection, the Producing Party also must clearly identify the
7 protected portion(s) (e.g., by making appropriate markings in the margins).

8 (b) for testimony given in deposition or in other pretrial or trial proceedings,
9 that the Designating Party identify on the record, before the close of the deposition,
10 hearing, or other proceeding, all protected testimony.

11 (c) for information produced in some form other than documentary and for any
12 other tangible items, that the Producing Party affix in a prominent place on the
13 exterior of the container or containers in which the information or item is stored the
14 legend “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL.” If only a portion or
15 portions of the information or item warrant protection, the Producing Party, to the
16 extent practicable, shall identify the protected portion(s).

17 5.3 Inadvertent Failures to Designate. If timely corrected, an inadvertent
18 failure to designate qualified information or items does not, standing alone, waive
19 the Designating Party’s right to secure protection under this Order for such material.
20 Upon timely correction of a designation, the Receiving Party must make reasonable
21 efforts to assure that the material is treated in accordance with the provisions of this
22 Order.

23 6. CHALLENGING CONFIDENTIALITY DESIGNATIONS

24 6.1 Timing of Challenges. Any Party or Non-Party may challenge a
25 designation of confidentiality at any time that is consistent with the Court’s
26 Scheduling Order. Unless a prompt challenge to a Designating Party’s confidentiality
27 designation is necessary to avoid foreseeable, substantial unfairness, unnecessary
28 economic burdens, or a significant disruption or delay of the litigation, a Party does

1 not waive its right to challenge a confidentiality designation by electing not to mount
2 a challenge promptly after the original designation is disclosed.

3 6.2 Meet and Confer. The Challenging Party shall initiate the dispute
4 resolution process by providing written notice of each designation it is challenging
5 and describing the basis for each challenge. To avoid ambiguity as to whether a
6 challenge has been made, the written notice must recite that the challenge to
7 confidentiality is being made in accordance with this specific paragraph of the
8 Protective Order. The parties shall attempt to resolve each challenge in good faith
9 and must begin the process by conferring directly (in voice to voice dialogue; other
10 forms of communication are not sufficient) within 10 days~~14 days~~ of the date of
11 service of notice. In conferring, the Challenging Party must explain the basis for its
12 belief that the confidentiality designation was not proper and must give the
13 Designating Party an opportunity to review the designated material, to reconsider the
14 circumstances, and, if no change in designation is offered, to explain the basis for the
15 chosen designation. A Challenging Party may proceed to the next stage of the
16 challenge process only if it has engaged in this meet and confer process first or
17 establishes that the Designating Party is unwilling to participate in the meet and
18 confer process in a timely manner.

Commented [4]: Same as LR 37
Commented [5R4]: Ok

19 6.3 Judicial Intervention. If the Parties cannot resolve a challenge without court
20 intervention, the Designating Party shall file and serve a motion to retain
21 confidentiality under Civil Local Rule 7 (and in compliance with Civil Local Rules
22 37 and 79-5, if applicable) within 21 days of the initial notice of challenge or within
23 14 days of the parties agreeing that the meet and confer process will not resolve their
24 dispute, whichever is earlier. Each such motion must be accompanied by a competent
25 declaration affirming that the movant has complied with the meet and confer
26 requirements imposed in the preceding paragraph. Failure by the Designating Party
27 to make such a motion including the required declaration within 21 days (or 14 days,
28 if applicable) shall automatically waive the confidentiality designation for each

Commented [6]: Time frame needs to be consistent with LR 37
Commented [7R6]: This is not inconsistent with LR 37's
requirement for the parties to confer within 10 days of the date of
service of the challenge notice.
Commented [JK8R6]: Rona fill in number of days

1 challenged designation. ~~In addition, the Challenging Party may file a motion~~
2 ~~challenging a confidentiality designation at any time if there is good cause for doing~~
3 ~~so, including a challenge to the designation of a deposition transcript or any portions~~
4 ~~thereof. Any motion brought pursuant to this provision must be accompanied by a~~
5 ~~competent declaration affirming that the movant has complied with the meet and~~
6 ~~confer requirements imposed by the preceding paragraph.~~

Commented [9]: Designating Party has the Burden and must file

Commented [JK10R9]: JPK to send draft language re IDC brief letter format.

Commented [JK11R9]: This language is fine.

7 The burden of persuasion in any such challenge proceeding shall be on the
8 Designating Party. Frivolous challenges, and those made for an improper purpose
9 (e.g., to harass, to impose unnecessary expenses and burdens on other parties, or to
10 attempt to make documents available in another proceeding) may expose the
11 Challenging Party to sanctions. Unless the Designating Party has waived the
12 confidentiality designation by failing to file a motion to retain confidentiality as
13 described above, all parties shall continue to afford the material in question the level
14 of protection to which it is entitled under the Producing Party's designation until the
15 court rules on the challenge.

16 7. ACCESS TO AND USE OF PROTECTED MATERIAL

17 7.1 Basic Principles. A Receiving Party may use Protected Material that is
18 disclosed or produced by another Party or by a Non-Party in connection with this
19 case only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle this Action. Such
20 Protected Material may be disclosed only to the categories of persons and under the
21 conditions described in this Order. When the Action has been terminated, a Receiving
22 Party must comply with the provisions of section 13 below (FINAL DISPOSITION).

23 Protected Material must be stored and maintained by a Receiving Party at a
24 location and in a secure manner that ensures that access is limited to the persons
25 authorized under this Order.

26 7.2 Disclosure of "CONFIDENTIAL" Information or Items. Unless otherwise
27 ordered by the court or permitted in writing by the Designating Party, a Receiving
28 Party may disclose any information or item designated "CONFIDENTIAL" only to:

1 (a) the Receiving Party's Outside Counsel of Record in this Action, as well as
2 employees of said Outside Counsel of Record to whom it is reasonably necessary to
3 disclose the information for this Action and who have signed the "Acknowledgment
4 and Agreement to Be Bound" that is attached hereto as Exhibit A;

5 (b) the officers, directors, and employees (including House Counsel) of the
6 Receiving Party to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary for this Action and who
7 have signed the "Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound" (Exhibit A);

8 (c) Experts (as defined in this Order) of the Receiving Party to whom
9 disclosure is reasonably necessary for this Action and who have signed the
10 "Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound" (Exhibit A);

11 (d) the Court and its personnel, and the jury;

12 (e) court reporters and their staff, professional jury or trial consultants, mock
13 jurors, and Professional Vendors to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary for this
14 Action and who have signed the "Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound"
15 (Exhibit A);

16 (g) the author or recipient of a document containing the information or a
17 custodian or other person who otherwise possessed or knew the information.

18 (h) during their depositions, witnesses, and attorneys for witnesses, in the
19 Action to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary and who have signed the
20 "Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound" (Exhibit A), unless otherwise
21 agreed by the Designating Party or ordered by the court. Pages of transcribed
22 deposition testimony or exhibits to depositions that reveal Protected Material may be
23 separately bound by the court reporter and may not be disclosed to anyone except as
24 permitted under this Stipulated Protective Order; and

25 (i) any mediator or settlement officer, and their supporting personnel, mutually
26 agreed upon by any of the parties engaged in settlement discussions.

27 7.3 Disclosure of "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" Information or Items. Unless
28 otherwise ordered by the court or permitted in writing by the Designating Party, any

1 information or item designated “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” may be disclosed only
2 to:

3 (a) the Receiving Party’s Counsel in this Action, as well as employees of said
4 Counsel to whom it is reasonably necessary to disclose the information for this
5 Action and who have signed the “Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound”
6 that is attached hereto as Exhibit A;

7 (b) Experts (as defined in this Order) of the Receiving Party to whom
8 disclosure is reasonably necessary for this Action and who have signed the
9 “Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound” (Exhibit A);

10 (c) the Court and its personnel, and the jury;

11 (d) court reporters and their staff, professional jury or trial consultants, mock
12 jurors, and Professional Vendors to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary for this
13 Action and who have signed the “Acknowledgment and Agreement to Be Bound”
14 (Exhibit A); and

15 (e) any mediator or settlement officer, and their supporting personnel, mutually
16 agreed upon by any of the parties engaged in settlement discussions.

17 **8. PROTECTED MATERIAL SUBPOENAED OR ORDERED
18 PRODUCTED IN OTHER LITIGATION**

19 If a Party is served with a subpoena or a court order issued in other litigation
20 that compels disclosure of any information or items designated in this Action
21 “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL,” that Party must:

22 (a) promptly notify in writing the Designating Party. Such notification will
23 include a copy of the subpoena or court order;

24 (b) promptly notify in writing the party who caused the subpoena or order to
25 issue in the other litigation that some or all of the material covered by the subpoena
26 or order is subject to this Protective Order. Such notification will include a copy of
27 this Stipulated Protective Order; and

28 (c) cooperate with respect to all reasonable procedures sought to be pursued

1 by the Designating Party whose Protected Material may be affected.

2 If the Designating Party timely seeks a protective order, the Party served with
3 the subpoena or court order will not produce any information designated in this
4 Action as “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL” before a
5 determination by the court from which the subpoena or order issued, unless the Party
6 has obtained the Designating Party’s permission. The Designating Party will bear the
7 burden and expense of seeking protection in that court of its confidential material and
8 nothing in these provisions should be construed as authorizing or encouraging a
9 Receiving Party in this Action to disobey a lawful directive from another court.

10 **9. A NON-PARTY’S PROTECTED MATERIAL SOUGHT TO BE
11 PRODUCED IN THIS LITIGATION**

12 (a) The terms of this Order are applicable to information produced by a Non-
13 Party in this Action and designated as “CONFIDENTIAL” or “HIGHLY
14 CONFIDENTIAL.” Such information produced by Non-Parties in connection with
15 this litigation is protected by the remedies and relief provided by this Order. Nothing
16 in these provisions should be construed as prohibiting a Non-Party from seeking
17 additional protections.

18 (b) In the event that a Party is required, by a valid discovery request, to produce
19 a Non-Party’s confidential information in its possession, and the Party is subject to
20 an agreement with the Non-Party not to produce the Non-Party’s confidential
21 information, then the Party will:

22 (1) promptly notify in writing the Requesting Party and the Non-Party
23 that some or all of the information requested is subject to a confidentiality agreement
24 with a Non-Party;

25 (2) promptly provide the Non-Party with a copy of the Stipulated
26 Protective Order in this Action, the relevant discovery request(s), and a reasonably
27 specific description of the information requested; and

28 (3) make the information requested available for inspection by the Non-

1 Party, if requested.

2 (c) If the Non-Party fails to seek a protective order from this court within 14
3 days of receiving the notice and accompanying information, the Receiving Party may
4 produce the Non-Party's confidential information responsive to the discovery
5 request. If the Non-Party timely seeks a protective order, the Receiving Party will not
6 produce any information in its possession or control that is subject to the
7 confidentiality agreement with the Non-Party before a determination by the court.
8 Absent a court order to the contrary, the Non-Party will bear the burden and expense
9 of seeking protection in this court of its Protected Material.

10 **10. UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF PROTECTED MATERIAL**

11 If a Receiving Party learns that, by inadvertence or otherwise, it has disclosed
12 Protected Material to any person or in any circumstance not authorized under this
13 Stipulated Protective Order, the Receiving Party must immediately (a) notify in
14 writing the Designating Party of the unauthorized disclosures, (b) use its best efforts
15 to retrieve all unauthorized copies of the Protected Material, (c) inform the person or
16 persons to whom unauthorized disclosures were made of all the terms of this Order,
17 and (d) request such person or persons to execute the "Acknowledgment and
18 Agreement to Be Bound" that is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

19 **11. INADVERTENT PRODUCTION OF PRIVILEGED OR OTHERWISE
20 PROTECTED MATERIAL**

21 When a Producing Party gives notice to Receiving Parties that certain
22 inadvertently produced material is subject to a claim of privilege or other protection,
23 the obligations of the Receiving Parties are those set forth in Federal Rule of Civil
24 Procedure 26(b)(5)(B). This provision is not intended to modify whatever procedure
25 may be established in an e-discovery order that provides for production without prior
26 privilege review. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d) and (e), insofar as the
27 parties reach an agreement on the effect of disclosure of a communication or
28 information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection, the

1 parties may incorporate their agreement in the stipulated protective order submitted
2 to the court.

3 **12. MISCELLANEOUS**

4 12.1 Right to Further Relief. Nothing in this Order abridges the right of any
5 person to seek its modification by the Court in the future.

6 12.2 Right to Assert Other Objections. By stipulating to the entry of this
7 Protective Order no Party waives any right it otherwise would have to object to
8 disclosing or producing any information or item on any ground not addressed in this
9 Stipulated Protective Order. Similarly, no Party waives any right to object on any
10 ground to use in evidence of any of the material covered by this Protective Order.

11 12.3 Filing Protected Material. Without written permission from the
12 Designating Party or a court order secured after appropriate notice to all interested
13 persons, a Party may not file in the public record in this Action any Protected
14 Material. A Party that seeks to file under seal any Protected Material must comply
15 with Civil Local Rule 79-5. Protected Material may only be filed under seal pursuant
16 to a court order authorizing the sealing of the specific Protected Material at issue.
17 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5, a sealing order will issue only upon a request
18 establishing that the Protected Material at issue is privileged, protectable as a trade
19 secret, or otherwise entitled to protection under the law. If a Receiving Party's request
20 to file Protected Material under seal pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5 is denied by
21 the court, then the Receiving Party may file the information in the public record
22 pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5 unless otherwise instructed by the court.

23 **13. FINAL DISPOSITION**

24 After the final disposition of this Action, as defined in paragraph 4, within 60
25 days of a written request by the Designating Party, each Receiving Party must return
26 all Protected Material to the Producing Party or destroy such material. Designating
27 Party's counsel agrees to maintain records for five years after the written request. As
28 used in this subdivision, "all Protected Material" includes all copies, abstracts,

Commented [12]: See prior point re 5 years

Commented [13R12]: I believe the ethical rules to which you're referring pertain to documents from an attorney's client, not documents produced by opposing counsel in litigation.

Commented [JK14R12]: JPK to send draft language for Cooley to maintain.

Commented [JK15R12]: Opinion No. 475 (1994) of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, Professional Responsibility and Ethics Committee, recommends a minimum retention period of five years past the date the matter was closed for attorneys' client files. The five-year period is drawn by analogy to rule 4-100(B)(3), Rules of Professional Conduct, requiring that attorneys preserve for five years records and accountings of funds, securities, and other properties of clients coming into their possession.

1 compilations, summaries, and any other format reproducing or capturing any of the
2 Protected Material. Whether the Protected Material is returned or destroyed, the
3 Receiving Party must submit a written certification to the Producing Party (and, if
4 not the same person or entity, to the Designating Party) by the 60 day deadline that
5 (1) identifies (by category, where appropriate) all the Protected Material that was
6 returned or destroyed and (2) affirms that the Receiving Party has not retained any
7 copies, abstracts, compilations, summaries or any other format reproducing or
8 capturing any of the Protected Material. Notwithstanding this provision, Counsel are
9 entitled to retain an archival copy of all pleadings, motion papers, trial, deposition,
10 and hearing transcripts, legal memoranda, correspondence, deposition and trial
11 exhibits, expert reports, attorney work product, and consultant and expert work
12 product, even if such materials contain Protected Material. Any such archival copies
13 that contain or constitute Protected Material remain subject to this Protective Order
14 as set forth in Section 4 (DURATION).

15 Any willful violation of the Order may be punished by civil or criminal
16 contempt proceedings, financial or evidentiary sanctions, reference to disciplinary
17 authorities, or other appropriate action at the discretion of the Court.

18 **IT IS SO STIPULATED THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.**

19 Pursuant to Local Rule 5-4.3.4, the filer of this document confirms that all
20 other signatories listed, and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the
21 filing's content and have authorized the filing.

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: COOLEY LLP

2 */s/ DRAFT*
3 BRIAN M. FRENCH (*pro hac vice*)
(bfrench@cooley.com)
4 RONA S. LI (*pro hac vice*)
(rproper@cooley.com)
5 KATHERINE BECHTEL (*pro hac vice*)
(kbechtel@cooley.com)
55 Hudson Yards
6 New York, NY 10001-2157
Telephone: (212) 479-6000
7 Facsimile: (212) 479-6275

8 WILLIAM K. PAO (252637)
(wpao@cooley.com)
9 ARIANA BUSTOS (345918)
(abustos@cooley.com)
10 355 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 900
11 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 561-3250
12 Facsimile: (213) 561-3244

13 LUKE C. CADIGAN (*pro hac vice*)
(lcadigan@cooley.com)
14 500 Boylston Street, 14th Floor
Boston, MA 02116-3736
15 Telephone: (617) 937-2300
Facsimile: (617) 937-2400

16
17 *Attorneys for Defendants John Shahidi, Nelk,*
Inc., Metacard, LLC, Nelk USA, Inc., and
Kyle Forgeard

18 Dated: KRISTENSEN LAW GROUP & EKSM, LLP

20 */s/ DRAFT*
21 John P. Kristensen (224132)
(john@kristensen.law)
22 120 Santa Barbara Street, Suite C9
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
23 Telephone: (805) 837-2000
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Trenton Smith and
Michael Burrows

25 **FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26
27 DATED:

1
2
3 Hon. Douglas F. McCormick
4 United States Magistrate Judge
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND AGREEMENT TO BE BOUND

4 I, _____ [full name], of _____
5 [full address], declare under penalty of perjury that I have read in its entirety and
6 understand the Stipulated Protective Order that was issued by the United States
7 District Court for the Central District of California on _____ [date] in the
8 case of *Smith v. Shahidi*, Case No. 8:25-cv-00161-FWS-DFM. I agree to comply
9 with and to be bound by all the terms of this Stipulated Protective Order and I
10 understand and acknowledge that failure to so comply could expose me to sanctions
11 and punishment in the nature of contempt. I solemnly promise that I will not
12 disclose in any manner any information or item that is subject to this Stipulated
13 Protective Order to any person or entity except in strict compliance with the
14 provisions of this Order.

15 I further agree to submit to the jurisdiction of the United States District Court
16 for the Central District of California for the purpose of enforcing the terms of this
17 Stipulated Protective Order, even if such enforcement proceedings occur after
18 termination of this action. I hereby appoint _____ [full
19 name] of _____ [full
20 address] as my California agent for service of process in connection with this
21 action or any proceedings related to enforcement of this Stipulated Protective
22 Order.

23 || Date:

24 | City and State where signed: _____

25 Printed Name:

26 || Signature: _____

EXHIBIT 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: SACV 25-00161-FWS (DFMx)
Title: Trenton Smith et al v. John Shahidi et al

Date: May 29, 2025

Present: **HONORABLE FRED W. SLAUGHTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Rolls Royce Paschal
Deputy Clerk

Not Reported
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

Not Present

PROCEEDINGS: SCHEDULING ORDER

The Court, having reviewed the pleadings and the parties' submissions pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), **VACATES** the Scheduling Conference set for June 12, 2025, and sets the following schedule:

Check one: [X] Jury Trial or [] Bench Trial [Tuesday at 8:00 a.m.]	11/17/2026
Parties' <i>Estimated</i> Trial Length	4 days
Pretrial Conference & Hearing on Motions in Limine [Thursday at 8:30 a.m.]	10/29/2026
Last Date to Hear Motion to Amend Pleadings /Add Parties [Thursday]	
Non-Expert Discovery Cut-Off (no later than deadline for filing dispositive motions)	4/29/2026
Expert Disclosure (Initial)	5/14/2026
Expert Disclosure (Rebuttal)	5/28/2026
Expert Discovery Cut-Off	6/11/2026
Last Date to <u>Hear</u> Motions [Thursday] • Motion for Summary Judgment due at least 6 weeks before hearing • All other motions due at least 4 weeks before hearing • Opposition due 2 weeks after Motion is filed • Reply due 1 week after Opposition is filed	8/6/2026
Deadline to Complete Settlement Conference [L.R. 16-15] [X] 1. Magistrate Judge [] 2. Court's Mediation Panel [] 3. Private Mediation	8/20/2026

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: SACV 25-00161-FWS (DFMx)

Date: May 29, 2025

Title: Trenton Smith et al v. John Shahidi et al

Trial Filings (first round) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Motions in Limine with Proposed Orders• Memoranda of Contentions of Fact & Law [L.R. 16-4]• Witness Lists [L.R. 16-5]• Joint Exhibit List [L.R. 16-6.1]• Joint Status Report Regarding Settlement• Proposed Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law [L.R. 52] (bench trial only)• Declarations containing Direct Testimony, if ordered (bench trial only)	10/8/2026
Trial Filings (second round) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oppositions to Motions in Limine• Joint Proposed Final Pretrial Conference Order [L.R. 16-7]• Joint/Agreed Proposed Jury Instructions (jury trial only)• Disputed Proposed Jury Instructions (jury trial only)• Joint Proposed Verdict Forms (jury trial only)• Joint Proposed Statement of the Case (jury trial only)• Proposed Additional Voir Dire Questions, if any (jury trial only)• Evidentiary Objections to Declarations of Direct Testimony (bench trial only)	10/15/2026

cc: ADR

Initials of Deputy Clerk: rrp

EXHIBIT 9

NOTE: CHANGES MADE BY COURT

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TRENTON SMITH and MICHAEL BURROW, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

V.

JOHN SHAHIDI, NELK, INC.,
METACARD, LLC, NELK USA, INC.,
and KYLE FORGEARD,

Defendants.

Case No. 8:25-cv-00161-FWS-DFM

ORDER RE REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF COURT ORDER [66]

CLASS ACTION

111

11

11

Having reviewed and considered the Request for Clarification of Court Order [66], the court **ORDERS** the court's May 30, 2025, Operative Scheduling Order [65], **MODIFIED** to read as follows (with changes indicated by italics):¹

EVENT	DATE
Check one: [x] Jury Trial or [] Bench Trial Tuesday at 8:00 a.m.	First Day: 11/17/2026
Parties' Estimated Trial Length	4 days
Final Pretrial Conference & Hearing on Motions in Limine Thursday at 8:30 a.m.	10/29/2026
Last Date to Hear Motion to Amend Pleadings /Add Parties Thursday	
Last Date to File Motion for Class Certification	10/2/2025
Last Date to File Opposition to Motion for Class Certification	11/13/2025
Last Date to File Reply in Support of Motion for Class Certification	12/11/2025
Last Date to Schedule In-Person Hearing on Motion for Class Certification Thursday at 10:00 a.m.	1/22/2026
Non-Expert Discovery Cut-Off	4/29/2026
Expert Disclosure (Initial)	5/14/2026
Expert Disclosure (Rebuttal)	5/28/2026
Expert Discovery Cut-Off	6/11/2026
Last Date to Hear Motions Thursday at 10:00 a.m. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Motion for Summary Judgment (due at least 6 weeks before hearing)• All other motions (due at least 4 weeks before hearing)• Opposition (due 2 weeks after Motion is filed)• Reply (due 1 week after Opposition is filed)	8/6/2026

¹ This Order is now the Operative Scheduling Order in this case. See *Mediterranean Enters., Inc. v. Ssangyong Corp.*, 708 F.2d 1458, 1465 (9th Cir. 1983) ("The trial court possesses the inherent power to control its own docket and calendar.").

1	Deadline to Complete Settlement Conference [L.R. 16-15] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Magistrate Judge (with Court approval) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Court's Mediation Panel <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Private Mediation	8/20/2026
4	Trial Filings (first round) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Motions in Limine with Proposed Orders• Daubert Motions with Proposed Orders²• Memoranda of Contentions of Fact and Law [L.R. 16-4]• Witness Lists [L.R. 16-5]• Joint Exhibit List [L.R. 16-6.1]• Joint Status Report Regarding Settlement• Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law [L.R. 52] (bench trial only)• Declarations containing Direct Testimony, if ordered (bench trial only)• Affirmative Deposition Designation(s)	10/1/2026

11
12 ///
13 ///
14 ///
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ² *Daubert* motions and oppositions to *Daubert* motions shall not exceed ten (10) pages in length.

1	Trial Filings (second round)	10/8/2026
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oppositions to Motions in Limine• Oppositions to Daubert Motions³• Joint Proposed Final Pretrial Conference Order [L.R. 16-7]• Joint/Agreed Proposed Jury Instructions (jury trial only)• Disputed Proposed Jury Instructions (jury trial only)• Joint Proposed Verdict Forms (jury trial only)• Joint Proposed Statement of the Case (jury trial only)• Proposed Additional Voir Dire Questions, if any (jury trial only)• Evidentiary Objections to Declarations of Direct Testimony (bench trial only)• Objections and Counter Deposition Designation(s)	10/15/2026

13
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15
16 

17 Dated: June 13, 2025
18
19 Hon. Fred W. Slaughter
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26

CC: ADR

27
28 ³ Pursuant to this court's order on pretrial and trial procedures, the parties shall not file replies to the motions in limine. (See Dkt. 64 at 4 ("Unless the court determines otherwise, counsel shall not file any replies.").) In addition, unless the court determines otherwise, the parties shall not file replies to any *Daubert* motions.